

Also, petition of Charles M. Kuhr, against sending troops to Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petitions of the Seward Republican Club, of New York; the Union League Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; and the New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Pa., to withdraw the troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Resolutions of the electors of Sand Beach Township, Huron County, Mich., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of citizens of Moreland and citizens of Ames, Okla., requesting withdrawal of United States troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolutions of Three Mile Bay Grange, No. 126, of Three Mile Bay; Port Leyden Grange, No. 1037; Lower Oswego Falls Grange, of Fulton, N. Y.; River Bank Grange, No. 534, of River Bank; Granby Grange, of Granby; Mount Pleasant Grange, No. 349, of Mount Pleasant; Depauville Grange, No. 59; and Denmark Grange, No. 535, of Denmark, Patrons of Husbandry, all of the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of George W. Burgess and other citizens of the town of Granby, Oswego County; the Dilts Machine Works, of Fulton; Oxbow Grange, No. 691, of Oxbow; Orwell Grange, No. 66, of Orwell; Point Peninsula Grange, No. 1030, of Point Peninsula; Pamela Grange, No. 68, of Pamela; Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, of Sandy Creek; Redwood Grange, No. 684, of Redwood; Phoenix Grange, No. 9, of Phoenix; West Monroe Grange, of West Monroe; and of Glenfield Grange, No. 548, of Glenfield, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity (H. R. 4412); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y.; Albion Center Grange, No. 270, of Albion, N. Y.; and Chaumont Grange, No. 855, of Chaumont, N. Y., Patrons of Husbandry; Carthage Board of Trade, of Carthage, N. Y.; B. W. Bennett, of Fulton, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of The Gleaners, a Sunday-school class of the Methodist Episcopal Society; the Women's Missionary Society and the Progressive Men's Class of the Methodist Episcopal Society, of Rockingham and other towns; the combined Women's Missionary Societies of the churches of Bellows Falls, constituting about 500 persons in said Rockingham, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill, so called, prohibiting saloons in Hawaii, and the McCumber-Terrell bill, so called, concerning the opium trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Groton Grange, No. 443, of Groton, Vt., protesting against the proposed reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Groton Grange, No. 443, of Groton, Vt., protesting against increase of magazine postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POST: Petition of the Empire Company, No. 68, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fletcher, Miami County, Ohio, to pass more stringent laws for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Hunt County, Tex., requesting immediate withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of citizens of Sheffield, Pa., for the immediate recall of United States troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Toledo Lodge, International Association of Machinists, of Toledo, Ohio, urging illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Greenwood Grange; Highland Grange, No. 22, of Catharine, Schuyler County; Stephens Mills, Fremont; Woodhull Grange, of Woodhull; Canisteo Grange, No. 400, of Canisteo; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 408, of Urbana; Oak Hill Grange, No. 574, of South Dansville; Bath Grange, No. 294, of Bath; Romulus Grange, No. 1181, of Romulus; Caton Grange, No. 248, of Caton; Jasper Grange, No. 619; Avoca Grange, No. 176, of Avoca; Howard Grange, No. 976, of Howell; Chemung Valley Grange, No. 57, of Elmira; Lodi Grange, No. 213, of Lodi; Hornellsville Grange, No. 846, of Hornell; and Towlesville Grange, No. 430, all of the State of New York, against proposed reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Union League Club of New York, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Resolutions of Leopold Zung Lodge, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, located at Goldsboro, N. C., asking that all Senators and Members of Congress aid in the passage of any resolutions which call for the modification or abrogation of all treaty relations with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Resolutions adopted by board of officers of Second Regiment, National Guard of New Jersey, urging passage of bill providing for pay for the Organized Militia of United States; to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Somerset Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, of Middlebush, N. J., against passage of any measure restricting to a period of three months the maximum time for the cold storage of staple foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of S. T. McDonald and other veterans of the Civil War, of Rosewood, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Sherwood pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 14, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

During the reading the following occurred:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion I am unable to hear what the Clerk is reading. It is not the fault of the Clerk. What is he reading?

The SPEAKER. He is supposed to be reading the Journal. The point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois is sustained, and the House will be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Has there been a demand made that the Journal shall be read in full, rather than a statement? If so, does that include the reading of the names of Members who voted?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk was not reading the names of Members who voted.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care at this time to demand the reading of the names. Of course I could, but it seems to me an exceedingly long Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk was reading the Journal in the usual way and will proceed.

The Clerk completed the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER announced the following change of reference: A bill (H. R. 2900) to authorize the acceptance by the United States of the gift of the Nathan Straus Pasteurized Milk Laboratory; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Resolution (H. Res. 70) providing for a committee to investigate the method of enforcement of the antitrust act and other matters; Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice discharged, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

PRINTING RESOLUTIONS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print the following resolution in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a certain memorial, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution asking for an investigation of the Taylor system of shop management.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa, one of the able new Members of the House, is probably not familiar with the practice of the House, which is not to print memorials in the Record. If it is once begun there is no limit, and if once begun the Record becomes so bulky that we never can find the thing we want on account of the number of memorials.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if this is a memorial or a resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. It is a resolution.

The SPEAKER. A resolution with a preamble.
Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that it requires unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print it in the Record.

Mr. MANN. Has it been introduced?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. PEPPER. It is being introduced now.

Mr. MANN. I object; the proper method of introducing it is to put it in the basket.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 88.

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 89.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of the committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 87.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House and during the recess of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 86.

Resolved, That the right of debate be extended to the two Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is during this Congress.

Mr. GARRETT. This Congress could not bind another. The language is the language used in the resolution that passed before.

Mr. MANN. They obtained the right to debate in two Congresses on that, yet I have no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. They got the right to debate in the second Congress merely because objection was not made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 745. An act providing for the erection of a statue to Thomas Jefferson at Washington, D. C.;

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C.; and

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States.

PUBLICITY OF ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2358) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," approved June 25, 1910, be, and the same is hereby, amended by repealing all of sections 5 and 6 of said act and enacting the following new sections in lieu thereof, so that said act as amended shall read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the treasurer of every such political committee shall, not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days next before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States, file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., with said Clerk an itemized detailed statement; and on each sixth day thereafter until such election said treasurer shall file with said Clerk a supplemental itemized detailed statement. Each of said statements shall conform to the requirements of the following section of this act, except that the supplemental statement herein required need not contain any item of which publicity is given in a previous statement. Each of said statements shall be full and complete, and shall be signed and sworn to by said treasurer.

"It shall also be the duty of said treasurer to file a similar statement with the Clerk within 30 days after such election, such final statement also to be signed and sworn to by said treasurer and to conform to the requirements of the following section of this act. The statement so filed with the Clerk of the House shall be preserved by him for 15 months and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection.

"SEC. 6. That the statements required by the preceding section of this act shall state:

"First. The name and address of each person, firm, association, or committee who or which has contributed, promised, loaned, or advanced to such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof, either in one or more items, money or its equivalent of the aggregate amount or value of \$100 or more, and the amount or sum contributed, promised, loaned, or advanced by each.

"Second. The aggregate sum contributed, promised, loaned, or advanced to such political committee, or to any officer, member, or agent thereof, in amounts of less than \$100.

"Third. The total sum of all contributions, promises, loans, and advances received by such political committee or any officer, member, or agent thereof.

"Fourth. The name and address of each person, firm, association, or committee to whom such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof, has distributed, disbursed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised any sum of money or its equivalent of the amount or value of \$100 or more, stating the amount or sum distributed, disbursed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised to each, and the purpose thereof.

"Fifth. The aggregate sum distributed, disbursed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised by such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof, where the amount or value of such distribution, disbursement, loan, advance, or promise to any one person, firm, association, or committee in one or more items is less than \$100.

"Sixth. The total sum disbursed, distributed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised by such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just reported?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he has consulted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] in reference to debate and amendment of the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, I will say that I had a brief conversation with the gentleman from Michigan yesterday, and it was my purpose to appeal to him before this request was made to know what arrangement, if any, we could make about debate. My understanding with the gentleman was that there would be no objection to this course, although he did not expressly say so.

Mr. AUSTIN. How about amendments to the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Of course opportunity will be given to amend.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What, if any, opportunity will be allowed for debate?

Mr. MANN. That is what we are trying to ascertain.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I wanted to agree with the gentleman from Michigan as to the length of time for debate.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me ask the gentleman why he does not put this bill upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar? If this request be granted, will it not practically overthrow or destroy the practice under the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to make a suggestion in reference to that, I will state that this is the only bill now on the calendar except the reciprocity bill. This is on the House Calendar. A call of committees will bring this bill before the House at once; so it is in a little different situation than it would be if there were a number of bills on the calendar and unanimous consent were being asked for its consideration.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Under the call of committees, perhaps, the question of right to debate might enter into consideration.

Mr. MANN. Under a call of committee, of course, this being on the House Calendar, the gentleman from Missouri would have the right at any time to move the previous question, which, if carried, would cut off debate and amendments. I understood that the gentleman from Missouri had or would agree to some arrangement for a proper time for debate on the bill, giving the time on this side to the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and on that side to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is my purpose, and no other purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I do not know how much time is required on this side. If gentlemen would indicate what they want, my impression is it will be found there will not be very much demand for time.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest that there be an hour on a side, with the right to offer amendments during that time, and either have the amendments pending then or else by unanimous consent read the bill under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. On our side that will be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to modify my request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill by adding to it that general debate proceed for two hours, and during that time any gentleman having the floor may offer amendment, the amendment to be considered as pending, and at the expiration of general debate the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to passage, one-half of the time of debate to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and one-half by myself, and I will say to him in that connection, we can yield more than one-half of the time if he has demand for it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the bill be considered by unanimous consent; that general debate proceed for two hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], during which time any gentleman who speaks shall have the right to offer amendment, and that they shall all be considered as pending, and at the end of two hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending that request, I desire to give notice that as soon as this bill is disposed of I intend to call up the bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama gives notice that as soon as this corrupt-practices bill be disposed of he will call up for consideration the Canadian reciprocity bill. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress this House passed a publicity bill which was approved by the President of the United States on the 25th day of last June. The bill which passed the House, by practically a unanimous vote, carried a provision requiring publicity of campaign contributions and disbursements to be made before elections, as well as after elections. After the bill passed the House it was amended in another body by striking out the provisions requiring publicity before elections. The purpose of the bill now pending is to restore to the law the provisions of publicity before elections as well as after elections. The changes proposed in existing law by this bill, in addition to restoring the feature of publicity before elections, enlarges somewhat the requirements of publicity before elections. As the bill passed the House in the last Congress, it required the first statement to be made by political committees to be made not more than 15 nor less than 10 days next preceding the day of election. This bill goes a little further and requires a like statement, a supplemental statement, to be made each 6 days after the filing of the first statement until the day of election. These are the changes proposed in section 5 of the law. The other section proposed to be amended is section 6. As the law now stands, while committees are required to give publicity of the names and addresses of every person, firm, or association who contributed \$100 or more, the amount contributed is not required by express language to be shown. It was the intention of the committee, and I believe the House so understood it, that the bill as it passed the House covers that point, but I do not think it does. In order to make it clear at least, the amendment proposed to section 6 of the existing law requires, in all cases where the amount contributed is \$100 or more, that the committee shall give the names and places of residence of such contributors,

together with a statement of the amount contributed by each, and another clause of the section requires similar publicity in reference to disbursements where the amount distributed to one person or committee is as much as \$100. The amended law, if this bill should pass, would require the name and address of each person or committee to be stated in all instances where the amount contributed or received is \$100 or more. These are the changes proposed. They do not change the general character of the law, but they seek to make it clearer and more efficient.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. In this bill is provision made for the publicity of accounts from a congressional committee in a single district? As the gentleman knows, we have in this country the large congressional committee, and in addition we have smaller congressional committees. Now, does this bill provide for publicity of accounts in the smaller congressional districts in a single district?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Answering the gentleman from Kansas, I will say that the bill does not contain provisions relating to the matters suggested by him.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why is that provision omitted?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman we are trying to draft and enact into law a measure of national scope and importance. We doubt the propriety and the legality of congressional action which would deal purely with a State matter. I believe that if this bill is passed the State of Kansas and the State of Missouri will adopt laws fashioned after it, requiring publicity from the committee, which the gentleman speaks of, before and after election. We deem it a matter of purely State control and not of national control, and therefore no legislation along the line suggested is attempted in this proposed amendment to our national publicity law.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do.

Mr. KENDALL. The operation of this law, then, when enacted would be confined entirely to the national congressional committees of the respective parties?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It would be confined entirely to committees which seek to influence elections in two or more States. It would be limited to the two principal committees of the two great parties.

Mr. KENDALL. Or the three great parties.

Mr. MANN. And the national committee, and every newspaper that circulates in more than one State.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. There is some question about that; we do not think so.

Mr. KENDALL. May I make this suggestion to the gentleman from Missouri? I did not understand the distinction which the gentleman deduced between the national congressional committee and the control of committees organized in the various congressional districts. I think there is not any differentiation between the two so far as respects their duties to report to the public as to contributions made and as to disbursements.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the gentleman. I think there is a doubt as to the power to compel them to do it. We have the power, I think, to compel a committee operating in more than one State, but I do not think that we have the power to provide for such publicity by committees whose operations are confined wholly to one State or one district.

Mr. KENDALL. Has the Congress any power to compel a Representative in Congress to make a report of disbursements in his campaign?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have not given special consideration to that question; but, conceding the power, I doubt the wisdom of such congressional interference with matters wholly within the jurisdiction and the power of the States to regulate and control.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri why it was that the amount of publication was fixed at \$100?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not contain any such limitation.

Mr. CULLOP. It says \$100 or more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that where the amount contributed is \$100 or more the committee shall give the name, address, and amount contributed by such contributor.

Mr. CULLOP. Why was it fixed, then, at any sum?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The reason is obvious, and I am sure my good friend from Indiana will agree with me. To require publicity as to each item might require such an endless amount of bookkeeping as would become cumbersome and destroy the very purpose of publicity.

Mr. CULLOP. Let me put this kind of case: A large manufacturer desires to contribute a larger sum. He employs 2,000 men. Suppose he gives each one of those men \$99 and has him contribute it in his name? Now, are you killing that kind of evil with this kind of bill? Such a thing as that could be done, and has been done, and I fear will be done again.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, may I answer that suggestion?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the other gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; I always yield with pleasure to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] that if any plutocrat were to distribute a number of single sums around among individuals in that way, to be contributed by them, it would be in fact a contribution by him, and it would have to be published as though it were a single sum.

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; but the books of the committee or of the Clerk of the House of Representatives would not show that fact, and I am desirous of having this bill so perfected that it would reach that kind of condition and punish that kind of violator of the law.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty sympathy with the thought and the desire of the gentleman from Indiana, but I have given a great deal of consideration to this measure, and I believe it is now in the most available shape it can be put in, if we wish to give effect to the desire of Congress and respond to the demand of the people, and I fear that if we attempt by this law to go as far as some gentlemen desire we may so burden it as to destroy the law by its own weight.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me submit another question to the gentleman: Could you not have put a provision in there whereby, when the report of the contribution to the committee was made, an affidavit would follow or accompany it, setting forth that contributions had been made in the name of other persons for some particular individual or corporation?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That would be practically to contradict the provisions of the law as it is written. The law requires them to make an itemized, detailed statement, giving the names of the contributors, but where contributions are made in sums less than \$100 the aggregate is reported, and not the various items.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. The question I wanted to ask was this: You have seemingly a very far-reaching provision for the filing of the statement of contributions with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. What I wanted to know is whether there is any method by which that will become the property of the general public? Has anybody and everybody the right to inspect these reports when made, and may they be published in the newspapers?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Allow me to say to the gentleman that the pending amendment expressly provides these reports shall be filed in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to be held by said Clerk as public documents and open to public inspection at all times.

Mr. HARDY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is in the law now and will be preserved in the law if this bill passes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I desire to ask the gentleman if there is anything in the existing law or in the bill which he has reported from his committee that provides that the contributor shall identify himself, and that the treasurer of the campaign committee shall ascertain the identity of the contributor?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The committee has never deemed it necessary to do that, hence there is no such requirement in

the bill. I am sure, answering the gentleman's question further, that nobody would contribute to the Democratic campaign fund who is ashamed to give his true name, and I do not believe any contributor to the other political party would conceal his name and identity.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman will acknowledge that some person desirous of contributing might make it known to the chairman of a congressional committee that he did wish to contribute, and he would intimate that contributions would come in due course of time that might be sent in to the treasurer on letters typewritten, signed "Tom," "Dick," "Harry," "John," and "William," and the treasurer would have no way, except as he might suspect, to know where it came from, and yet he would publish the statement that he received the contributions from these persons, who might be mere myths.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this law seeks to control the action and conduct of the political committee and not of the individual who makes the contribution.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Ought there not to be a provision to make it practicable to determine who does actually contribute?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the committees will comply with the law as it is proposed to be amended in this bill, I believe it will give to the people what they desire and will give effective publicity to campaign contributions. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. We passed in the last Congress the law which it is now proposed to amend. Will the gentleman indicate exactly what changes are now proposed in sections 5 and 6, and in what respect it is different from the bill as we passed it in the House before?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois was not in his seat—where he generally is, sometimes to my great annoyance—when I made the statement just a few minutes ago.

Mr. MANN. I saw that the gentleman was talking, but he was talking to that side of the House, and we on this side of the House could not hear him.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Then I will explain it to the gentleman's side of the House. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I desire to say that the publicity bill as it passed the House in the last Congress carried a provision requiring publicity to be given not more than 15 nor less than 10 days next before the election, but no other publicity before the election. That feature was stricken out in the Senate. This bill seeks not only to restore the provision which was in the bill as it passed the House last year, but to add to it the requirement that, in addition to the first statement required to be filed, the same committee shall every six days thereafter until the election file a similar supplemental statement containing all items not contained in statements previously filed. That, I believe, is the only change made in section 5.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, it is perfectly plain that if the treasurer filed his statement 15 days before the election, then he would have to file two supplemental statements.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If he filed his statement 10 days before the election, then he would have to file but one supplemental statement, and if he filed it 11 days before the election, then he would have to make no statement during the 5 days next preceding the election.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Would it not be better to require the supplemental statement to be filed at a fixed time before the election? This provision gives a chance to juggle about the time, if there is anything to that.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that under this provision of the bill it is possible to file the last statement as much as six days before the election; but that gives six days in which the newspapers can ventilate the contents of the statement. It gives six days for publication and discussion on the stump and through the weekly press, and it seems to me that is about as effective as we can make it.

Mr. KENDALL. Does it not also give six days for the use of a large corruption fund that will not be known about by the public press?

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to make one suggestion.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman wait until I finish with the gentleman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman from Illinois had asked me a question, and I was replying to it.

Mr. MANN. Waiving that for the present, if I may ask a few more questions in reference to section 6, as I understand the changes in section 6 in the existing law they first require the amounts contributed to be stated?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Where the amount is over \$100.

Mr. MANN. Where it is over \$100. I notice that the gentleman has changed the word "total" to "aggregate" in some places. Is that for the purpose of making a change in the meaning?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I made those changes because it occurred to me that the word "aggregate" was the more appropriate word to use where it is used, and using the word "total" at the end of the paragraph. If the gentleman convinces me that that is wrong, I will be glad to change the word.

Mr. MANN. I asked the question because of the change in the wording, striking out the word "total" in one place and leaving it in in another.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I had the purpose in mind which I have stated to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I think they both mean the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana for a short question. I hope gentlemen will not prolong this, because I want to yield some time to the other side.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to suggest that in line 6 the word "sixth" be stricken out and the word "third" inserted, so that it will read "every 3 days after they report 15 days before election."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that he can offer such an amendment, and I shall not oppose it. I think it is possible to have too much. I realize that this measure is not perfect, and the only question is whether the gentleman can make it more nearly perfect, and I hope he can. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri was a member of the committee in the last Congress and assisted in the preparation of the bill which was reported at that time. Now, that bill provided for a preliminary report not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days before the election. As I understand it, the bill of the gentleman provides that after that report there shall be another and possibly two subsequent reports. It occurs to me, if I may suggest to the gentleman, the difficulty in drafting the bill in the last Congress, in which I participated with the gentleman from Missouri, was in fixing upon a proper time for this preliminary report. It did not seem to us that it would be wise to have a succession of preliminary reports. Why would it not be better, instead of imposing this burden on the political committees, if it is thought that 15 or 10 days before election is too early, to require one preliminary report to be made, say, 5 days before the election? That would open it up to discussion, and it seems to me that the advantage of other preliminary reports prior to that report immediately before election would be very slight.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Answering the gentleman, I will say that the objection I have to it is the same objection that governed me and the gentleman from Massachusetts when we agreed on the phraseology of the first bill, introduced a few years ago, making the period not less than 10 days before election. The idea is to give at least 10 days when the preliminary report shall be filed, 10 days of publicity through all the newspapers, and the nearer we get down to the date of election the more impossible would it be for the weekly newspapers, which go into all the homes, to handle the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The gentleman stated that the object of the bill was to control the great congressional committees. Is there anything in this bill which would prohibit these committees from accepting contributions from corporations?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. In this bill; no. It was expressly omitted for the reason that I participated somewhat in the enactment of the law a few years ago which makes it a crime, punishable by imprisonment, for corporations to contribute to campaign funds.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. KOPP. In the present law, section 6, subdivision 4, it is provided that the names must be given of each person who has received a payment of \$10 or more. I notice that in the gentleman's bill he has increased that amount to \$100. Will the gentleman state the purpose of the increase in amount?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will be glad to do so. In this I confess that the judgment of the committee may be in error, but the thought that inspired us was that to require the great national committees of either party or the congressional national committee to give name and address of each person who gives the committee or who receives from the committee \$10 would require such an endless amount of bookkeeping that it would be entirely too cumbersome. That is the only reason for the change referred to.

Mr. KOPP. Will not this open the door to fraud wider than the old law? It is well known that entries of disbursements of \$99 will be made, whereas there could not be very substantial sums or payments in less sums than \$10. It seems to me that we could waive the necessity for greater bookkeeping in order to get greater purity of elections.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. My answer is the same that I made to the gentleman from Indiana a few moments ago. While it is possible, I can not conceive that the gentlemen who compose the great committees are going to juggle with the law by giving the committee in a certain State or district several items of \$99.95 each in order to evade the law. I will say that if they do, if such a practice should prevail, I will gladly join in an amendment that will cure it.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman for information whether the report of each of the committees after the last election was of any great length?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Oh, I think not of any great length.

Mr. KOPP. Then it seems to me that the fear that the bookkeeping will be complicated is unfounded.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman understands that in these campaigns frequently there are several thousand contributions.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Did the committee of which the gentleman is chairman take into consideration the great importance of having a publication of contributions which secures the nominations of men? The nomination to-day in many localities is of the very first importance, and the money is contributed there to corrupt the electorate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I fully appreciate that statement and agree with what the gentleman says, but that is a matter, I think, that ought to be controlled by State legislatures and not by Congress. I do not want to undertake to go into the domain of a State or to encroach upon the State jurisdiction.

Mr. COOPER. I think the point raised by my colleague [Mr. KOPP] is a very strong one. What would prevent a man of many millions from giving to a hundred of his employees or a thousand of them \$50 or \$90 apiece, without any record being made public? It will not do to say that you rely upon the honor of people.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I grant that there is a way of evading this law, but in the case the gentleman speaks of the man will be liable himself to criminal prosecution.

Mr. COOPER. By what law would he be liable?

Mr. KENDALL. Yes; under what law would he be liable?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Under the law which requires a corporation—

Mr. KENDALL. But the gentleman spoke of an individual disbursing this money.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If a corporation gives you money to contribute, then the corporation violates the law and would be subject to punishment.

Mr. KENDALL. But suppose an individual gives a hundred dollars each to a thousand men, would your law touch that?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It would not, unless the fact should be known to the committee, in my opinion.

Mr. CULLOP. He is already liable under the law.

Mr. LEWIS. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether his committee considered the advisability of prohibiting the receipt of contributions that had not been published, after the last report?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. We did consider it, and we found that emergencies might exist which would make it highly proper and right for a great committee to collect money within 48 hours of an election, and therefore we omitted any reference to that matter.

Mr. KENDALL. I want to make this rejoinder to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP], that in the case I supposed, of course the candidate would be liable under the laws of his State, but that conduct could not be ventilated before the public in order to affect the election. That is the point I made.

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. Did the committee consider the question of limiting the amount of money to be legitimately expended by a candidate?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No. We considered it; yes; but this bill does not cover it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman object to an amendment to that effect?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I certainly would, because I think it would destroy the law. I do not believe this Congress has a right to say how much a citizen can contribute for any purpose in his State.

Mr. AUSTIN. I mean a candidate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, a candidate. The State laws ought to govern that. I again repeat, I am opposed to an invasion of the power and jurisdiction of the State.

Mr. AUSTIN. To fix the amount of legitimate expenses, to prohibit a candidate for Congress from exceeding that amount.

Mr. LANGLEY. It might cost more in Tennessee than in Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think the State ought to regulate that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman accept an amendment in effect that where the election of a Member of Congress is shown to have been obtained by the corrupt use of money it would be void.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No; but I will vote with the gentleman to turn such a man out of Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why not put it in this bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Because the bill is not drawn for that purpose, and such a provision would be entirely out of harmony with this law.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I was wondering how the gentleman could hold that opinion, in view of the fact that the Constitution says that Congress shall be the judge of the election returns and the qualifications of a Member. Why would it not be proper, in view of that language in the Constitution, to legislate along those lines?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to make myself clear, and if I have failed I fear I will be unable to do so. I do not doubt the power of Congress to thus legislate, but I doubt the wisdom of such legislation. Now, it may be we are all wrong about this, but if it should turn out that we are wrong and abuses grow up which may be remedied, I will go as far as any gentleman on this floor to reach out after those abuses and see if we can not regulate them in the future.

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] desires to consume time, I will be glad if he would do so now. However, Mr. Speaker, before yielding the floor, I desire to offer the following amendment and have it pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the preamble, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' approved June 25, 1910, be and the same are hereby amended to read as follows:"

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is a mere change of phraseology in the preamble.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I am glad the gentleman offered that to save me the trouble.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I now reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly favor this measure, but, in my judgment, it does not begin to go far enough. As a matter of fact, it apparently costs the Republican national committee a great deal more money for a congressional campaign than it does the Democratic Party [applause on the Democratic side] for this reason: The Democratic fights in the South are made at the primaries, and that is where the Democrats spend their campaign money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact that the Democrats rely on the people to carry the elections and you do not? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KAHN. Oh.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. Just for a question.

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it not a fact that in most of the States where they have primary laws—it is so in Georgia and most of the States in that section—that the States require in primary elections that everyone shall file an account of the expense incurred in that primary election?

Mr. KAHN. That may be so, but the country will look to the report filed in the House of Representatives and will not go to every one of the States to find out what was expended in each one of the different States. Now, this bill was framed for the purpose of giving publicity to campaign expenditures—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. I only have five minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Just for one question.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman has said that in the South we spend our money in the primaries. Has there been any money spent in any such primary equal to what Sibley expended in Pennsylvania?

Mr. KAHN. Well, I am not familiar with conditions in the South, but I have heard that your primary contests there are intensely sharp and bitter, and I dare say there is a considerable sum of money spent in many districts in the South at the primaries. Of course when your primary is over you do not have to spend a dollar at the general election. [Applause on the Republican side.] Your contests are decided at your primaries.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman makes a correct statement about the expenditure of money in the primaries in the South, but what I want to ask was if any such amount was expended in a primary in the South as in Sibley's nomination in Pennsylvania?

Mr. KAHN. I suppose Mr. Sibley learned the expenditure of money when he was a Democrat. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I simply want to call to the attention of the House and to the attention of the country the fact that this bill is entirely inadequate, and in order to have a proper publicity bill there should be a clause inserted which would compel the filing of accounts at all primaries, as well as at the general elections, and I would gladly vote for such a feature to be included in the pending bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important in a republican government than to have honest and pure elections. The results of legislation and administration have never been and can never be altogether satisfactory if the source of power is corrupted or polluted in any form or manner. I am in favor of all legislation that is calculated to safeguard the integrity of the ballot in the United States and to protect every citizen in the land in the right to vote and in the fearless exercise of that right against the corrupting power of money or any other of the devices and methods that have been employed in years past to prevent fair elections. Every elector ought to have the right to vote, and to have that vote counted the way he casts it. Elections ought to express the mature, free, and honest convictions of the electors in all parts of the Union.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, can accomplish but little along that line. The only improvement it purports to make over the law that was enacted in the last Congress is that it requires reports of funds collected by national committees, congressional and general, before as well as after elections. It makes, as has been remarked, absolutely no provision to protect the purity, the integrity of the institution of the primary in the United States, which is becoming quite general in the States.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman seems to be basing his opposition to this bill on the proposition that it does not include primaries. Did not the Republican national convention, of which you were a member, vote down a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] providing for the publicity of campaign funds before the election?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, if the gentleman will give heed, the House of Representatives in the last Congress passed a bill of that kind, and I voted for it.

Mr. JAMES. I am talking about the party nationally.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me say to the gentleman that he is mistaken when he says I was a member of the last Republican national convention. I was not.

Mr. JAMES. Do not dodge the issue.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not dodge the issue. I voted for a measure requiring reports before as well as after elections. I have done my share toward securing full and complete reports of the funds that have been accumulated and expended, and that may be accumulated and expended by campaign committees.

Mr. JAMES. I am willing to assume that the gentleman is better than his party, but what I wanted to know was the position of the gentleman's party on this question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman seems to be well advised upon that proposition. He has been giving me some suggestions that had passed entirely from my own mind in relation to it. Now, the suggestion has been made in relation to a report concerning the expense of the primary in a congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania where one of the candidates spent more than \$40,000. Some of the States provide for primaries without requiring publicity of the expenditures of candidates. I say that it is just as important in probably four-fifths of the districts of the United States, and probably more important, to have publicity of expenditures used to secure nominations as it is to have publicity of amounts collected and used for the purpose of influencing elections. Reference has been made to a great section of the country where the only real election is at the primaries, and this bill does not have any bearing upon the primary at all, and therefore does not apply to that section of the country.

It does not apply to that section of the country, and yet Representatives there are insisting on and demanding and clamoring for legislation that will make public the moneys that are expended to influence elections, because they are entirely free from its operation.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker. Special elections occur occasionally, and there may be a vacancy in a congressional district; under conditions in the membership of the House the two parties stand practically equal, and the election might control the politics of the House. And yet this bill makes absolutely no provision in relation to special elections where a single Representative may be elected and where the election might be accomplished by the expenditure of fabulous sums.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the gentleman can cite any instance in the last 20 years where the national Democratic Party ever took an active part, or any part, in the nomination or primary election of Representatives in Congress, either South, East, or West? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What difference does it make?

Mr. RAKER. It makes all the difference on earth.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Representatives in Congress are Federal officers. They make laws for all the country. And while we are in the business, why do we not go far enough in our legislation to accomplish something that will be of substantial benefit?

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask the gentleman: When his side of the House had this bill under consideration, why did not he and his colleagues offer this amendment and incorporate it in the law when he had the opportunity?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It came up before on a motion to suspend the rules and was not amendable. We did incorporate the provisions contained in this bill, but when that bill came back from the other branch of Congress the provision in relation to contributions before, as well as after primaries, was stricken out.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this bill. It contains a little good. But it seems to me that the great committee that prepared the bill and brought it into the House should have broadened its provisions, should have made it relate to special elections as well as general elections, should have made it re-

late to primary elections wherever they are required by the laws of any State, and if that had been done I think it would have gone a long step farther in purifying elections.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR]?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman know, speaking about Pennsylvania, that it was due to an act of the Pennsylvania Legislature relative to expenditures at the primaries that Mr. Sibley's extravagant expenditures were indicated and this resulted in forcing him from the Republican ticket in his district, thus showing the importance of this publicity at the primaries as well as at elections?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand that was the case. That was a Republican measure, and this is a Republican measure, because we passed it through the last House. This is a Republican movement. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Republican Party always has stood in favor of honest elections, always has advocated the principle that every citizen of the country who assists in bearing the burdens of the Government ought to have something to say with respect to the making and enforcement of laws and to the levying of taxes and the expenditure of public money.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague from Indiana?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is it not a fact that at Gary, Ind., in the election of 1908 several thousand people cast their votes who had never taken out their first naturalization papers?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, if there has been any such situation in the State of Indiana it must have been down along the Ohio River where my colleague resides. Nothing like that happened in the northwestern part of the State in the district that I represent. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman say that condition never occurred in the election of 1908 at Gary, Ind.?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I can say, and say it with absolute truth, that that charge was made in 1908, and a full investigation under the guise of a contest was made by a Democratic organization, and after an exhaustive investigation the proceeding was dismissed; and the men who instituted it have not even paid the costs of the proceeding. We do not vote anybody in northwestern Indiana except those who have the right to vote, but we do allow everybody there to vote who has the right to vote and we see that the votes are counted. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman want some time?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not want any time.

Mr. KENDALL. If the gentleman is going to defend the State of Pennsylvania, we want him to do it in a voice loud enough to be heard.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania please speak loud enough for the Chair to hear him?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it will be a pleasure to make an effort to have the Chair hear me. I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] a question or two.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Very well. If I can answer them I will be glad to.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is a member of the committee that reported this bill. I would have asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] these questions, but I was afraid I would be unable to make him hear me, the distance being great between us. I understand it is the purpose of this bill to publish, prior to the election, contributions of money made, in the words of the bill "for the purpose of influencing elections". That is true, is it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I suppose so.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know that while there is a time set for filing these reports, there is no time set for making them up?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. They must be made up before they can be filed.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true. Suppose the treasurer of the national committee or of the congressional committee happens to reside in the city of San Francisco and has to file his report here in Washington, his report must necessarily be made up several days prior to day of filing. I suppose he will file his report or statement here on the day stated in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The way to avoid that difficulty is to move the Republican headquarters to Washington.

Mr. BUTLER. I have nothing to do with the location of the treasurer. I am only putting a question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], whether or not his committee considered the necessity of requiring these reports to be made up on a day certain?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman has asked me what the committee did and what consideration they gave to this measure. Yesterday in the House, when the joint resolution amending the Constitution of the United States was under consideration, I stated the circumstances regarding the meeting of the committee; that notices were sent out the evening before and did not reach the Republican members of the committee, except in one instance, until the committee had met and acted. I will now say to the gentleman that in the one hour during which, as I am informed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], the committee was in session it found time from its arduous labors in considering the amendment to the Constitution to report out this bill. I can not tell you just what consideration the committee gave to all these questions. I will say to the gentleman that it is my purpose to vote for this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. So is it mine.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Because I think it is a step in the right direction; but I do believe it would have been wiser if the committee had not reported it so soon, and I believe we could then have had a better bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me a minute or two?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes if he wishes it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there can be no difference of opinion upon the purpose of this bill. It is to make known to the public in advance contributions of money made for the purpose of influencing elections. It seems to me it might have been made effective. If the committee had included in this bill a provision that there should be no contributions of money made either for general or for primary election purposes I presume I would have voted for such provision, although I doubt whether an election can be conducted, no matter how honestly, without using for legitimate purposes certain sums of money.

But this bill will not furnish the knowledge that the public demands. It does provide for the day when these reports shall be filed, but it does not provide the time when they shall be made up. If they are filed five days before the election, they must be made up prior to that time, of course. Contributions that were intended to be made might be made after the report is made up but before the report is filed, because of the time necessary for its transmission by mail or otherwise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the other gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUTLER. If he does not take more than a minute and three-quarters of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that we have a better corrupt-practices act in Pennsylvania than this one, and better calculated to give the public information about these transactions than does this bill?

Mr. BUTLER. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct in his conclusion.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. COOPER. I observed the reply of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to his colleague as to the excellent character of the corrupt-practice act in the State of Pennsylvania. Does that provide for the publication before election?

Mr. BUTLER. It provides for a filing in the office of the prothonotary of the different courts within so many days after the election. Fifteen days, one of my colleagues says.

Mr. COOPER. After the money has been contributed and expended and the men are in office.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is after the nomination.

Mr. BUTLER. After the nomination.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any provision for the publication before the nomination?

Mr. BUTLER. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is both after the primaries and after the election.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask whether the conversation over on that side is a private conversation, or are we supposed to know what is going on?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, we have an act in Pennsylvania that requires all of us who are candidates for office to make and return under oath the amount of contributions made to us for political purposes and the amount expended, but that act requires us to make it after the primary and before the general election. But if we had been making an act in the State of Pennsylvania requiring us to publish in advance the moneys contributed for political purposes it would have been made effective. It would have required the report—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman time enough to finish his statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania all the time the gentleman wants.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman from Michigan for the privilege and to the Speaker for stating it. This act seems to be weak in the particulars I have stated. There is opportunity for the contribution to be made after this report has been made up but before filing.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Why can not Congress pass a law making it a felony for anyone to offer to contribute, advance, or loan, or for any committee or any other committee to receive any money within five days prior to the election, or prior to a primary?

Mr. BUTLER. I have no doubt Congress could make such a law; and if it did, that it would meet all the complaints and just complaints that are now made, but this bill makes no such provision.

Mr. COOPER. It could, because we could amend it.

Mr. BUTLER. I am criticizing the bill for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MANN. If no contributions could be made after five days before election, who would pay the bills of the committee when it was in debt?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether the political philanthropists are all dead or not.

Mr. MANN. They could not contribute if they were not.

Mr. COOPER. Suppose we compelled the committee to live within its income and not to go in debt for corrupt purposes; let it expend what it received.

Mr. MANN. There is no concern on earth that makes no bills until it has the money in the bank. The gentleman from Wisconsin or the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Illinois, none of them can do it, and no political committee can do it.

Mr. BUTLER. I would anticipate that no prudent man, treasurer of a committee, would take the chances of getting contributions after election, especially if his side had been unsuccessful. Mr. Speaker, I do not care for any more time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP].

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill, but in one respect I think it takes a step backward, and a vital one. There is no doubt in my mind but that the people of this country are demanding absolute purity in elections, and when we are drawing an act, we should draw it so as to have it as airtight as possible. Now, when they increase the amount of expenditure from \$10 to \$100, which the committee is required to report, it is leaving a loophole through which practically all of the funds of a great committee can be expended. I hold in my hand the statement of the receipts and the expenditures of the last national Democratic congressional committee during the last election, and nine-tenths of the items in that report are between \$10 and \$100. If this bill passes, all of those would be grouped under one head. It seems to me that if these gentlemen on that side, as well as on this side of the House, are desirous of having absolute purity in elections, they should not object to putting that back to \$10.

The only argument that has been advanced for increasing the amount from \$10 to \$100 is that it will save a great amount of bookkeeping. The statement of the Democratic campaign committee covers five or six typewritten pages, and if that is all the bookkeeping that is required, surely the argument fades to nothing. So it seems to me that we ought to adopt an amendment unanimously to make this \$10; that no contribution shall be made by any person, firm, or corporation in excess of \$10, nor shall the committee expend any amount above \$10, without having it accounted for as such. I therefore offer the two amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten"; and on page 4, line 3, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this bill may satisfy the majority members of the committee that reported it; but if it is offered in the interests of purer elections, of a purer ballot box, it will not satisfy the American people. It accomplishes nothing that the present law does not accomplish. If Democracy is interested in real reform, let your investigations commence with the primary election and let those investigations continue until after the election in November, and let such investigations be so complete that they will cover all expenditures, whether made by a national committee or made by a candidate himself or by his friends. Let such investigations be most thorough; let them apply to all contributions of which the candidate has any knowledge.

Last fall, when knowledge of the contributions made to the Democratic national congressional committee was published in the newspapers of the country, I was amazed and surprised, as were the people of the State of Iowa, to learn that the man who gave double the amount that any other man gave to the Democratic national committee was Mr. W. C. Beer, of New York.

Who is W. C. Beer? W. C. Beer formerly resided in my State, and while residing there he was known as a poor man. He gave little or nothing in the way of contributions to the Democratic Party in those days, but last fall W. C. Beer made a contribution double the amount of that made by any other Democrat in the United States. That contribution was made the day before election, and at that time W. C. Beer was the confidential man of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. BUTLER. Was Mr. Beer ever a Republican?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know. He paid little attention to politics when he lived in the State of Iowa, but his uncle, Judge Reed, was elected to Congress from Iowa as a Republican; but, Mr. Speaker, I do know that when he made this contribution to the Democratic campaign fund he was the confidential man of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. If you are honest in your attempt to secure publicity—

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Just a minute. If you are honest in your endeavors to obtain publicity of campaign contributions, you should try to ascertain the real source of these contributions. Committees should not be permitted to put in the names of persons as contributors to campaigns when the contribution is in fact made or paid by some one other than the person who is reported as having made the contribution.

Mr. STANLEY. What is Mr. Beer's official relation to J. Pierpont Morgan?

Mr. GOOD. He is the confidential man to J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., and I know of no one closer to J. Pierpont Morgan himself than Mr. W. C. Beer, of New York, who made this enormous contribution.

Mr. STANLEY. Is he the confidential friend of Mr. Morgan or in his employ?

Mr. GOOD. In his employ, I understand.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Stanley] that he had better apply for information to the Democratic national congressional committee, which might be better informed.

Mr. STANLEY. Oh, the Democratic national committee is not nearly as close to Mr. Morgan as gentlemen on that side.

Mr. GOOD. The record does not bear out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Clayton). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGuire].

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. I am for it because there is some good in it, but there are a great many things that might contribute to the interests and integrity of the American people, the candidates and political committees, that are not in it. I come from a State where the Democratic Party has the governor and has had since we became a State. It has the senate and the house of representatives. Upon their accession to power we had a nonpartisan election law, an election law against which no man had ever raised his voice. Now we have an election law that is a disgrace to civilization and to the human race, passed by a Democratic senate, a Democratic house, and signed by a Democratic governor of the State. I am a little surprised that the Democratic Party will even go this far in their pretense of being in favor of honest elections in this country. Why should not this provide for a publication of contributions in the primaries? I want to relate to you gentlemen a little incident: We have primary elections, and in the last campaign I have every reason to believe the man who ran against me for the nomination spent four times as much as he could spend under the election law—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. May I have a minute more?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield the gentleman a minute additional.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan concedes me a minute more. The penalty for having spent more than he may spend under the law is that he can not go upon the ballot. The gentlemen in charge of that State, the State officials, were in favor of his nomination. After he was defeated he never did render an accounting, and he has not today, of the money that he spent in the primary campaign; and hence I say, if you want to be square with the people, if you are what you profess to be, if you want to guarantee honest elections, if you want to make men honest in their campaigns, insert in here a provision that the candidate must account for every dollar and every penny he spends prior to his nomination.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. JAMES. I understood the gentleman of whom the gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about was a Republican who sought the nomination of your party.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. But he was favored by the Democratic officials of the State.

Mr. JAMES. And you say now he has not made—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I ask for a minute more.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. JAMES. You say now there is a law in your State that requires he shall make publication of the amount expended?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Yes; and the penalty is he can not go on the ballot unless he does so.

Mr. JAMES. And you claim that he has not done so?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. He has not.

Mr. JAMES. Why was he not prosecuted?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Because we have Democratic officials in our State. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] I have only mentioned, Mr. Speaker, one of the vast number of violations of the law in that State, and you can not get a prosecution.

Mr. JAMES. Does the gentleman charge here on this floor that the laws in your State are such that one Republican can not have another Republican prosecuted for a violation of the law?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Not by a Democratic governor and Democratic State officials, and that is exactly what I say.

Mr. JAMES. I want to say to the gentleman that I have a better opinion of his State than he gives to it.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I have a good opinion of the State, but not of the gentlemen who have been in power in that State. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend two sections of a law which we passed in the last Congress. I have no criticism whatever to make of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rucker] or his committee in reporting a bill to the House providing simply for the amendment of these two sections and not including in this report at this time other matters which I think ought to be enacted into law.

The original act provides only for reports of contributions of committees as they are defined in the act, where the committee endeavors to influence the election in two or more States, and hence excludes entirely the matter of contributions either for

the election of a Member of Congress to his own committee or for primary elections, because there are no committees in existence which seek to influence, under the terms of the act as it was defined on the floor here, the primaries in two or more States. The amendments which have been inserted are the changes which have been inserted by the bill; in my opinion are desirable changes—in the main, at least. Under the original law, apparently, while the committees were required to furnish the names of persons contributing on the amounts of expenditures of over \$10—the names of persons—they were not required to report the amount contributed or expended. That was undoubtedly an inadvertent defect in the law. And the amendment to section 6 of the original act as carried in here is designed to correct that mistake. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], presiding over his great committee, will bring into this House a bill in regard to campaign contributions both for the election of individual Members of Congress and for their nomination.

The gentleman stated, as I understood him, that it was not within the power of Congress, but that that was a State matter. What is the distinction between our control over elections of Members of Congress in more than one State and our control over the election of a Member in a district?

If we have the constitutional authority to effect the election of 10 Members of Congress, we have the equal authority to control the election of one Member of Congress. There is no distinction absolutely between our power to require a statement of all expenses in regard to the election of a single Member and our power to require the knowledge in regard to the election of all Members.

I have myself been several times a candidate for Congress. At a recent election the gentleman who ran against me is reported to have spent over \$40,000 in endeavoring to accomplish his election. At a primary a few years ago a very fine gentleman ran against me, and was reported to have spent over \$40,000 in seeking to be nominated. For myself, I am not able to expend such large sums of money, nor am I willing to accept contributions of such amounts, which would allow me to expend them. And I believe it would be far more desirable and effective if Congress should require a man who is a candidate at the primary and at the election to report all of his contributions and expenses and to limit the amount which he may receive or expend. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman wish any more time?

Mr. MANN. I would like another minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, I understand perfectly well that in many districts in the country a nomination is equivalent to an election. I have always considered that that was the case in my district, although it was not quite so certain last fall as it had been on previous occasions.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. You get there just the same.

Mr. MANN. There is no reason why we should permit the expenditure of such sums of money for primaries or elections. And I hope the gentleman will take under consideration the right of Congress to control. If there be State laws, let there be in addition a national law. Many men are prone to take chances on the violation of State laws, when their own friends or party friends are in charge of local offices, who would not dare to tamper or challenge the execution of a national law. On both sides of this Chamber, in my opinion, there exists an honest desire that the elections of the country shall be as fair and just as possible, that they should not be affected by corruption, and that they shall not be influenced by the expenditure of great sums of money.

On both sides of the Chamber gentlemen think alike on this question. Why should we not meet with an affirmative response the demand of the country that in these days, when the people believe more now than they ever did before in the effectual control of government by the citizens and believe that their elected officials shall be elected honestly and that they shall have the opportunity to select capable representatives without fear of the influence of money or other corrupt methods? I hope that the House, with the gentleman from Missouri and his party now in responsible control, will not be satisfied with simply crossing a "t" or dotting an "i" on an act which this House passed during the days when the Republicans were in responsible control, but that they will go a step further and add a law, new on the statute books, which we are all prepared to vote for and not feel that they have done their duty simply by bringing into the House a bill which

we passed practically as now brought in once before. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining to each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I ask, then, that the gentleman from Missouri use some of his time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer one amendment and have it pending for consideration, to be acted upon at the proper time, and if the Clerk will take it down I will read it to him. It is this:

On page 2, line 6, strike out the word "sixth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "third."

The purpose of offering this amendment is to have the last publication occur not more than three days before the election. The object is to provide that there shall not be time intervening between the last publication and the day of election, so that a large "slush fund" may be collected and distributed throughout the country for the purpose of corrupting the voters. For this reform the Democratic Party has been contending for years.

I am somewhat astonished that Members on that side of the House, our Republican friends, say they are in favor, and their party is in favor, of this kind of legislation. I would ask, How long since have they been converted to this reform? In 1908 the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, from the day of his nomination to within 60 days of the election, appealed to the Republican candidate to cooperate with him to make public before the election all the contributions to their respective campaign funds. The Republican candidate refused to do it; his party refused to do it; but within six weeks of the election, for the purpose of meeting an indignant public opinion, the Republican candidate agreed to a publication of the contributions after the election, instead of before, as the Democratic candidate had requested.

I will ask gentlemen on that side of the House, if your party stands for this kind of a reform, why was it that when it was in the control of the Senate last spring it struck out the most beneficial clause of all in the legislation proposing this reform—the publication of contributions to campaign funds before the election, the provision contained in that bill—and amended it so that the publication would be made after the election? If your party stood in favor of this reform, why did it not leave the provision on that subject as it was when it left the House, and as it had been passed by the House here? Why did they strike out the most important feature of the bill if they stood in favor of this reform?

If gentlemen on that side desired to have reformation by legislation in regard to primary elections, last June, when this bill was before the House, and when you were here with a large majority on this floor, why did you not incorporate that provision in the bill as it passed this House then? What since the adjournment of Congress last June has converted you to this great doctrine of reform? Was it the election in November, 1910, whereby you were swept out of power and the Democratic Party in this House put in power? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe in the publication before the election, in order that the people may know what interest, if any, is contributing to the campaign funds of any candidate or any party, and that the people may have this knowledge, so they can intelligently cast their votes. It is a step in the right direction, and the bill should be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks. — THE RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I object.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the effort of our friends on the other side to convince the country that they ardently desire more rigid legislation to prevent the improper use of money in influencing elections is grotesque and amusing. You know, and I know, and the world knows, that a law preventing the use of money in elections, in order to be effective, must provide for publishing the names of the men who are seeking to control the electorate before the ballots are cast. The sole purpose of

legislation of this kind is to notify the voter beforehand that certain influences, backed by enormous amounts of dirty money, are attempting to control the electorate. To make a display of the way the election was bought after the goods are delivered is to lock the door after the horse is gone. When you controlled this House you positively refused to allow the record to be made before the election. More than that, when you met in national convention and it was proposed, while you were in the limelight, to pledge your party to the exposure of campaign contributions, you voted it down with hoots and yells. Now, when we have you tied hand and foot, when you are driven to the wall, with a yea-and-nay vote confronting you, you protest vociferously about your great desire for untainted elections.

Mr. JAMES. In the convention they voted it down by 900 to 84.

Mr. STANLEY. By an overwhelming majority. There was no roll call there. You spoke then from your hearts; you gave vent to your purposes. In that convention you did not say you would expose the men who made campaign contributions, because you feared you might stop the contributions.

We are twitted here with the statement that Morgan's confidential man contributed \$1,000 to a Democratic campaign fund. Now, I very much dislike to discuss men, high or low, especially when they are not here to answer for themselves. I would hesitate to engage in mere abuse of Mr. Morgan just as much as the humblest individual in the land.

But when by innuendo you would put in the Record that J. Pierpont Morgan and the interests he represents are behind the Democratic Party, then I demand that the whole truth be known. When the most nefarious legislation that was ever enacted was on its passage in the Senate—to allow the use of railroad bonds and the bonds of the United States Steel Corporation to be used as a basis for our currency—Mr. Morgan hung over the railing of the Senate gallery, eagerly approving the words of Nelson A. Aldrich. That was a display of his Democracy. When I attempted to have his darling child, the United States Steel Corporation, investigated, and had a resolution for that purpose before the Rules Committee, who opposed it? Not one Democrat. Who favored it? Not one Republican. Do not "shake your gory locks" at us and tell us because Morgan's confidential man gave a thousand dollars that Morgan or Morgan influences are behind the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I apologize for rising again so soon to address the House. I do it under the jibe of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], who sees fit to criticize the committee for its action. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] has placed this committee under fire before the country, but we have no apologies to offer to the gentleman or to anyone else for our prompt action on these two bills. We point him to the action of the House yesterday, which by an overwhelming vote, with only 15 votes in the negative, favored the election of United States Senators by the people, and these 15 votes were Republicans. We now have a united and unanimous Democracy in favor of this bill.

So far as the hasty action of the committee is concerned, that side of the House, the Republican side, has frequently had it pointed out to them on the floor of this House that unless they ceased to bury legislation in the committee rooms and to make legislation in the committee rooms, that unless they would let it be brought on the floor of the House and acted upon here, they would be driven from this House.

They have been frequently warned on the floor of this House that unless they ceased to increase the expenditures of the people's money they would be driven from this House, yet they went on, and even in the Sixtieth Congress increased new offices and salaries to the extent of \$30,000,000. They have been frequently reminded that unless they ceased to place the burden of tariff legislation upon the backs of the people that these burdens would become in time like the burdens of the children of Israel, and that they would be driven from this House. And now, sir, these warnings have been exemplified by the empty Republican seats on the other side of this House. I tell you, sir, we must listen to the demands of the people. And one of these demands is prompt, though prudent, action in the committee rooms. [Applause.] I can not see how any Member of this House can afford to record himself opposing pure election. God speed the day when election corruption funds shall be driven not only from my State, but from every State in the Union. Every corporation or person undertaking to debauch the voter should be swiftly, surely, and severely punished.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Can the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] consume some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall].

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the pending bill, and ask that the Clerk read it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1910, 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' shall be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the treasurer of every such political committee shall, not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States, file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., with said Clerk, an itemized detailed statement, sworn to by said treasurer and conforming to the requirements of the following section of this act; and upon every day after the making such statement, and before the day of election, the books and accounts of such committee shall be open to public inspection. It shall also be the duty of said treasurer to file a similar and final statement with said Clerk within 30 days after such election, such final statement also to be sworn to by said treasurer and to conform to the requirements of the following section of this act. The statements so filed with the Clerk of the House shall be preserved by him for 15 months, and shall be a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, one word in explanation of the amendment which I have proposed. It is section 5 of the act as it passed the last House of Representatives, with this addition: That after the preliminary report, made not more than 15 and not less than 10 days before the election, shall have been made, then the books of the committees between the time of making the report and the day of election shall be open to public inspection. There is no reason in the world why contributions as they are received should not be printed in the newspapers when they are received, just as contributions for any public object or for charities are published in newspapers at the time they are received.

It seems to me it is very impracticable to impose on the treasurer the duty of making up a final and definite statement of the receipts and disbursements and swearing to it and filing it in Washington every few days. This gives a starting point of having a preliminary report, and after that the books shall be open to the newspapers, which will have access to them, and they can print the receipts as they are received.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCALL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman offers this as a substitute for the pending bill?

Mr. McCALL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The bill contains sections 5 and 6 of the law. The gentleman's proposition only affects section 5.

Mr. McCALL. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert what was read.

Mr. MANN. But that does not cover section 6.

Mr. McCALL. It strikes out section 6.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman want to strike out section 6 entirely?

Mr. McCALL. Yes; because although section 6 is in the bill, I do not think it ought to be in.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, from the discussion here to-day it seems apparent that there may be a greater division on party lines on the pending proposition than there was on the one yesterday. However, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when we come to vote on this measure our Republican brethren will join us in the enactment of this wholesome piece of legislation, and do it with the same practical unanimity that they joined with us yesterday in proposing the joint resolution for the amendment of the Constitution.

I congratulate the Republican Party on the progress that it has made since its last national convention. It has progressed to the extent of joining with the Democrats to secure the passage of a measure requiring the publication of campaign expenses after election. I believe that the majority of the members of that party in this Chamber to-day will join with the Democratic Party in the demand made in the Democratic platform written at Denver in 1908; that the campaign contributions shall be published before election. That is what this measure seeks to do, and I hope the Republicans will progress to the extent of again voting with us.

It comes with bad grace from our Republican brethren here who have been in control of the House 16 years, in control of

the Senate and in control of the executive department, to chide us with the failure to bring in a proposition of more far-reaching legislation along the lines than this proposes. They have had uninterrupted control for 16 years. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party never wanted any reform on this subject. It never espoused any reform in this direction. It never made any efforts in this line seriously until it saw the light which broke with a full force and effect and showed the members of that party the way the American people were thinking and demanding, and the Republicans were convinced in November last. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They saw a great light then, and they now object to this measure, going as far as it does, because it does not go further. We hand it back to you, gentlemen, with suggestion that for 16 years nearly you refused to go at all. Because you say this measure is not perfect, because you say this measure does not go as far as it should, you contend that is an argument against the efforts that we are making here to-day to bring about this reform.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party initiated the movement in the country for the publication of campaign contributions. It was the first party that had the courage to write it in its platform, and a former Member of this House was the first public man outside of official life in the United States to espouse the publication of campaign contributions, Hon. Perry Belmont, of New York, a Democrat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I consider this a rather harmless little bill, and I regret exceedingly that any gentleman on either side of the center aisle in this House should endeavor to treat it as a partisan measure. A measure that proposes to promote purer elections and to throw safeguards around the election of public officials is something to which all parties ought to agree. I think this bill should be so amended as to provide up to what time these statements should be made. The bill provides when the statements shall be filed, or within what time they shall be filed, but it does not name the date or length of time preceding the election down to which all receipts and disbursements shall be shown. I think this is a defect that should be remedied by amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in the few minutes that I have that I am not at all satisfied with the scope of this bill or the length to which it goes. I believe that the use of money in primaries and elections is the greatest evil that confronts this Government to-day, and that the greatest danger to our republican institutions is the unrestricted use of money to control primaries and elections. We have had a number of illustrations of this fact in very recent times, and the condition of affairs disclosed in Adams County, Ohio, is not exceptional or one confined to that locality alone. I would, if I had my way, make it a criminal offense for any committee or any person or corporation to send money into a district to influence the election of Members of Congress in that district. Publication of election expenses alone, whether before or after election, is not a sufficient remedy for the evil. I would limit the uses to which money might be expended in any primary or election, and I would make it apply to every congressional district. It is absurd to say that Congress has no control over the election of Members of Congress in any single State or district. The control of Congress, or the right of Congress to control, over such elections is expressly provided for by section 4, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

We can, if we will, control all primaries and all elections in any State and in every district of the United States so far as the election of Congressmen is concerned. This bill, to be at all effective, should provide for publication in each district of all moneys contributed or expended by or on behalf of any and every candidate for Congress. The bill as drawn would not affect my district at all. No national congressional committee ever knows that there is such a district. They only send money, if they do send it at all, into the close districts or districts where the use of money may influence the election. Who is it, Mr. Speaker, that contributes money for the election of Members of Congress? No man in my district, no farmer of this country, no small business man, and no laboring man contributes money to influence the election of Congressmen to represent him. It is the great financial interests that hope to benefit by legislation that contribute money to control the election of Members of Congress, and I suppose it is contributed for the reason that an equivalent is expected in return. If I had my way I would prohibit such contributions absolutely and make it a criminal offense. Truly, money is "the root of all evil" and the source of all corruption, and if pure elections is what we desire, the use of money to influence votes should

be regarded as one of the greatest crimes, for it is treason to our free institutions. [Applause.] This bill is just one little step in the right direction, and so I shall vote for its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by having it strike out all after the enacting clause down to line 23 on page 2 of the bill, so that it would be simply a substitute for the first section.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman will be modified as requested.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of offering an amendment to this bill. I am heartily in favor of this bill so far as it goes, and I congratulate the gentlemen on the other side of this House for the promptness with which they have undertaken to legislate upon this subject, which is of great importance and interest to every citizen of the country. But, gentlemen, you have not gone far enough. It is useless to talk about legislating concerning committees which control elections in two or more States and leaving the districts themselves and the candidates themselves in general elections and primary elections absolutely alone; and upon that point I heartily agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]; and therefore it is my purpose to offer here, for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to vote in good faith upon it, the proposition of requiring the candidate himself to file under oath a statement of the amount of money he has received and expended for election purposes. If there is any reason on earth why the Congress of the United States should control the congressional-election committees they should also control the individual who is a candidate for election to the House. This goes to the root of this matter. I now offer this amendment:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That a bill entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' be amended by the addition of a section to be numbered 6a, which section shall read as follows: 'It shall be the duty of every candidate or Representative in the Congress of the United States, at least 10 days before any general or primary election before which he is a candidate, to file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, in the District of Columbia, a full and correct statement of all moneys or things of value received from any source and used by him in any way for the purpose of securing his election, and such statement shall contain a full account of all moneys used by any agent or Representative of said candidate for said purposes when known to the candidate. The said statement shall be verified by the oath of the candidate taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the law of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate or Representative in Congress. The several district courts of the United States.'"

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman if he would consent to an amendment including the word "Senator," so it would read "any Senator or Representative?"

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JACKSON. I will accept that if I have time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas is now pending.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The unanimous consent was that any gentleman could offer an amendment in his time. Of course, under the rule you could only have four pending.

Mr. MANN. The reason I made the inquiry was whether the amendment had been read by the Clerk; whether the Clerk had finished reporting the amendment.

The SPEAKER. He had not, and he will conclude the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to punish violations of this act and on conviction of any candidate for a violation of this section, or of filing a false statement of such expenses he shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri has six minutes remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to call attention to the fact that this bill fails of its purpose in the fifth section. Under the language of that section, if Members of the House will look to the same, they will note that the treasurers who are required to file reports are not required to file them before any special election, nor would they be required

to file them before an election for Members of Congress occurring in the State of Maine, which falls at a different date from that of the election in the other States. These officials are required to file their reports before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States. This is not as it should be, for these reports should be filed before every election, not only before a general election, but before an election occurring in States like Maine, and before special elections occurring by virtue of writs issued by the governors of States. In order to meet that situation I send up this amendment, which I ask to have pending at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 2, page 2, after the word "which," insert the words "a Representative," and in line 3 strike out the words "in two or more States."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, while I was momentarily absent from the Chamber a few moments ago my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. McGuire] assaulted our State and its citizenship in a way, in my judgment, that is not becoming to a Representative.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will not have the time to yield. I have only three minutes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman is mistaken about my assaulting the State.

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield when I have only three minutes.

I have hastily scanned the notes of his remarks, and though they are not corrected, I think they are, as I consulted numerous men on this side of the Chamber, practically correct. But the embarrassment and the sting are lessened somewhat from the fact that the chief malefactor that he assaults was his Republican opponent in the primary.

Now, I will perhaps just have time to say this one thing: If his Republican opponent is guilty of any crime in our State, I think the rest of the delegation from that State, in both branches and of both political parties, will see to it that the court doors are held wide to prosecute any malefactor of justice, whether Republican or Democrat. It seems to me it ill becomes any Member from a State to assault an entire people, assault Republican courts, assault Democratic courts, assault State administration, and assault the whole body politic. Slanders from time to time have fallen from the lips of different political opponents with reference to our State. I do not contend more for my State than for any other, but I do assert here now that the State is full of patriotic and honest people.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield in three minutes. I again renew the assertion that the State administration of our State is not more corrupt than those of other States. I again assert that the Republicans and Democrats alike in our State are not more corrupt than in other States. [Applause.] Our State is new, and conditions are new.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has two minutes remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House upon the fact that we are now about to give the country another demonstration of Democrats keeping the faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am surprised, after finding such unanimity of publicity sentiment on that side of the House, that the great political party which has been in power for 16 years failed during its reign of power to enact a publicity law. I am satisfied that my Republican friends are getting better all the time, and after one or more elections in which we have more publicity our Republican friends will be real good citizens and will thereafter respond to the demands of the people.

I am sorry this law can not go as far as some of the zealous advocates of publicity seem to want to go. I welcome the assistance of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall], who to-day advocates publicity before elections, and who so recently, I think within two or three years, has been converted to that faith. I know the gentleman is in good faith and an earnest advocate of publicity. Mr. Speaker, let me say that some suggestions have been made here which, I think, will improve the bill. Some amendments have been proposed to which I shall offer no objection. One of them, at least, is offered in good faith for the improvement of the bill. I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wis-

consin [Mr. Kopp] to strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten" in two paragraphs of the bill. [Applause.] You can not give too much publicity for Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We will go as far as any Republican in giving real publicity to campaign contributions and expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, let me say that this scene to-day has revived in my memory another couplet of poetry:

When the devil is sick, the devil a monk would be;

When the devil is well, a devil of a monk is he.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Chair to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment first.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "the" and insert the word "said"; and in line 19, add "s" to the word "statement."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendments in the order in which they come.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri:

Strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' approved June 25, 1910, be, and the same are hereby, amended to read as follows:"

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I notice in reading the amendment that the Clerk read "June the twenty-fifth."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read that part of the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

June 25, 1910.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. KOPP:

On page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. KOPP:

On page 4, line 3, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP:

On page 2, line 6, strike out the word "sixth" and insert the word "third."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 145, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. McCall:

Strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 22, on page 2, and insert the following:

"That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1910, 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' shall be amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the treasurer of every such political committee shall, not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States, file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., with said Clerk, an itemized detailed statement, sworn to by said treasurer and conforming to the requirements of the following section of this act; and upon every day after the making of such statement and before the day of election the books and accounts of such committee shall be open to public inspection. It shall also be the duty of said treasurer to file a similar and final statement with said Clerk within 30 days after such election, such final statement also to be sworn to by said treasurer and to conform to the requirements of the following section of this act. The statements so filed with the Clerk of the House shall be preserved by him for 15 months, and shall be a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall] may be allowed to correct his amendment so as to leave the bill as already amended down to and including section 9, and make his amendment apply only to what comes after the words "section 5" down to section 6.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I assent to that.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

So that the amendment will read: "Strike out of the bill all after the words 'section 5,' in line 10, on page 1, down to and including line 20, on page 2, and insert the following."

Mr. MANN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts—

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, which is to strike out the portion of the bill named and insert the amendment that has been read by the Clerk.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 65, noes 101.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for another reading of the amendment.

Mr. JAMES. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the roll call. The Clerk will proceed to call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 111, nays 196, answered "present" 2, not voting 79, as follows:

YEAS—111.

Akin, N. Y.	Gillett	Loud	Rees
Anderson, Minn.	Good	McCall	Roberts, Mass.
Austin	Greene	McCreary	Roberts, Nev.
Barchfeld	Guernsey	McGuire, Okla.	Roddenbery
Bartholdt	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinley	Rodenbery
Bowman	Hanna	McKinney	Sloan
Bradley	Harris	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hartman	McMorran	Smith, Saml. W.
Butler	Hawley	Madden	Speer
Cannon	Hayes	Madison	Steenerson
Carter	Hill	Malby	Stephens, Cal.
Catlin	Hinds	Mann	Sterling
Copley	Howell	Martin, S. Dak.	Stevens, Minn.
Crago	Howland	Matthews	Switzer
Crumpacker	Humphrey, Wash.	Miller	Taylor, Ohio
Dalzell	Jackson	Mondell	Thistlewood
Danforth	Kahn	Moore, Pa.	Utter
Davidson	Kennedy	Morgan	Volstead
Davis, Minn.	Kent	Murdock	Vreeland
Dodds	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Needham	Wedemeyer
Dwight	Knowland	Nye	Wildner
Dyer	Kopp	Patton, Pa.	Willis
Farr	Lafean	Pickett	Wilson, Ill.
Focht	Lafferty	Porter	Wood, N. J.
Fordney	La Follette	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Langham	Pray	Young, Kans.
French	Langley	Prince	Young, Mich.
Fuller	Lawrence	Prouty	

NAYS—196.

Adair	Cox, Ind.	Hamlin	Lloyd
Adamson	Cravens	Hammond	Lobeck
Aiken, S. C.	Cullop	Hardwick	McCoy
Alexander	Curley	Hardy	McDermott
Allen	Daugherty	Harrison, Miss.	McGillicuddy
Anderson, Ohio	Davis, W. Va.	Harrison, N. Y.	McHenry
Ansherry	Dent	Haugen	Macon
Ashbrook	Denver	Helgesen	Maguire, Nebr.
Barnhart	Dickinson	Helm	Martin, Colo.
Bartlett	Dickson, Miss.	Henry, Tex.	Mays
Bathrick	Dies	Holland	Moon, Tenn.
Beall, Tex.	Difenderfer	Houston	Moore, Tex.
Bell, Ga.	Dixon, Ind.	Howard	Morrison
Berger	Donohoe	Hubbard	Moss, Ind.
Blackmon	Doremus	Hughes, Ga.	Murray
Boohar	Doughton	Hughes, N. J.	Nelson
Borland	Dupre	Hull	Norris
Brantley	Edwards	Humphreys, Miss.	Oldfield
Brown	Esch	Jacoway	Padgett
Buchanan	Faison	James	Page
Bulkley	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Parran
Burke, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Johnson, S. C.	Patten, N. Y.
Burleson	Flood, Va.	Jones	Pepper
Burnett	Floyd, Ark.	Kendall	Peters
Byrnes, S. C.	Foster, Ill.	Kindred	Post
Callaway	Francis	Kipp	Pujo
Candler	Garrett	Kitchin	Rainey
Cantrill	George	Konig	Raker
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Konop	Randell, Tex.
Cary	Goeke	Korbly	Ransdell, La.
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lamb	Rauch
Claypool	Gordon	Lee, Ga.	Reilly
Clayton	Gould	Lenroot	Richardson
Cline	Gray	Lever	Robinson
Collier	Gregg, Pa.	Lewis	Rothermel
Connell	Gregg, Tex.	Lindbergh	Rouse
Cooper	Gudger	Lithicum	Rubey
Covington	Hamill	Littlepage	Rucker, Colo.

Rucker, Mo.
Russell
Sabath
Saunders
Scully
Shackelford
Sheppard
Sherley
Sherwood
Sims

Sisson
Slayden
Small
Smith, Tex.
Sparkman
Stanley
Stedman
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Tex.
Stone

Sweet
Taylor, Ala.
Taylor, Colo.
Thayer
Thomas
Towner
Townsend
Tribble
Turnbull
Tuttle

Underhill
Underwood
Warburton
Watkins
Whitacre
Wickliffe
Wilson, N. Y.
Wilson, Pa.
Witherspoon
Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinkaid, N. J. Webb
NOT VOTING—79.

Ames	Ellerbe	Hensley	Palmer
Andrus	Estopinal	Higgins	Payne
Anthony	Evans	Hobson	Plumley
Ayres	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Bates	Fields	Latta	Riordan
Bingham	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Boehne	Fornes	Legare	Sharp
Broussard	Foster, Vt.	Levy	Simmons
Burgess	Fowler	Lindsay	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Gallagher	Littleton	Smith, Cal.
Calder	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Stack
Conry	Glass	McKenzie	Sulloway
Cox, Ohio	Goldfogle	Maher	Sulzer
Currier	Graham	Mitchell	Talbott, Md.
Davenport	Griest	Moon, Pa.	Talcott, N. Y.
De Forest	Hamilton, W. Va.	Morse, Wis.	Tilson
Draper	Heald	Mott	Weeks
Driscoll, D. A.	Hefflin	Olmsted	White
Driscoll, M. E.	Henry, Conn.	O'Shaunessy	

So the amendment was lost.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. AYRES with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Until further notice:

Mr. WEBB with Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. KINKAID of New Jersey with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. SHARP with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. DE FOREST.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. DRAPER.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. AMES.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. FOSTER of Vermont.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. HEALD.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. SULZER with Mr. SULLOWAY.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. LEGARE with Mr. TILSON.

From to-day and ending Monday noon:

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. BATES.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

From April 6 until April 14, inclusive:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. WEEKS.

From to-day and ending in three weeks:

Mr. LATTI with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment, offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

That a bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected" be amended by the addition of a section to be numbered 6a, which section shall read as follows: "It shall be the duty of every candidate or Representative in the Congress of the United States, at least 10 days before any general or primary election before which he is a candidate, to file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, in the District of Columbia, a full and correct statement of all moneys or things of value received from any source and used by him in any way for the purpose of securing his election, and such statement shall contain a full account of all moneys used by any agent or representative at large of said candidate for said purposes when known to the candidate. The said statement shall be verified by the oath of the candidate, taken before an officer

authorized to administer oaths under the law of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate or Representative in Congress.

"The several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to punish violations of this act, and on conviction of any candidate for a violation of this section or of filing a false statement of such expenses, he shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were 106 ayes and 140 noes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported by the reading clerk now at the desk so that Members can understand what it is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent, pending his demand for the yeas and nays, that the amendment may be again reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the demand of the gentleman from Illinois for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 131, answered "present" 2, not voting 83, as follows:

YEAS—172.

Adair	French	Lindbergh	Rees
Akin, N. Y.	Fuller	Linthicum	Roberts, Mass.
Anderson, Minn.	George	Loud	Roberts, Nev.
Ansberry	Gillett	McCoy	Rucker, Colo.
Austin	Goeke	McCreary	Sabath
Barchfeld	Good	McDermott	Saunders
Barnhart	Goodwin, Ark.	McGuire, Okla.	Scully
Bartholdt	Greene	McKinley	Sherwood
Bathrick	Guernsey	McLaughlin	Sims
Berger	Hamill	McMorran	Sloan
Borland	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Smith, J. M. C.
Bowman	Hanna	Madison	Smith, Saml. W.
Brown	Hardy	Maguire, Nebr.	Speer
Buchanan	Harrison, N. Y.	Malby	Steenerson
Bulkley	Hartman	Mann	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, S. Dak.	Haugen	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Burke, Wis.	Hawley	Matthews	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Hayes	Miller	Stone
Cannon	Helgesen	Mondell	Sweet
Cary	Hill	Moore, Pa.	Switzer
Catlin	Hinds	Morgan	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper	Howell	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Ohio.
Copley	Howland	Mott	Thayer
Covington	Hubbard	Murdoch	Thistlewood
Cox, Ind.	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Towner
Crago	Jackson	Nelson	Townsend
Crumpacker	Kahn	Norris	Tuttle
Dalzell	Kendall	Nye	Underhill
Danforth	Kennedy	Page	Utter
Davidson	Kent	Pattin, Pa.	Volstead
Davis, Minn.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pepper	Vreeland
Dodds	Knowland	Pickett	Warburton
Doughton	Konop	Porter	Wadsworth
Dupre	Kopp	Pou	Whitacre
Dwight	Lafan	Powers	Wickliffe
Dyer	Lafferty	Pray	Wilder
Esch	La Follette	Prince	Willis
Estopinal	Langham	Prosty	Wilson, Ill.
Farr	Langley	Pujo	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Lawrence	Rainey	Wood, N. J.
Fordney	Lenroot	Randsell, La.	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Lewis	Rauch	Young, Kans.
Foster, Ill.			Young, Mich.

NAYS—131.

Adamson	Denver	Hughes, Ga.	Post
Aiken, S. C.	Dickinson	Hughes, N. J.	Raker
Alexander	Dickson, Miss.	Hull	Randall, Tex.
Allen	Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly
Anderson, Ohio	Difenderfer	Jacoway	Richardson
Ashbrook	Dixon, Ind.	Johnson, Ky.	Robinson
Bartlett	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Roddenbery
Beall, Tex.	Doremus	Jones	Rothermel
Bell, Ga.	Edwards	Kindred	Rouse
Blackmon	Ellerbe	Kipp	Rube
Booher	Faison	Kitchin	Rucker, Mo.
Brantley	Ferlis	Konig	Russell
Burleson	Fitzgerald	Korbly	Shackleford
Burnett	Flood, Va.	Lamb	Sheppard
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Ga.	Sherley
Byrnes, Tenn.	Francis	Legare	Sisson
Callaway	Garnor	Lever	Staylen
Candler	Garrett	Littlepage	Small
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Littleton	Smith, Tex.
Carlin	Gordon	Lloyd	Sparkman
Carter	Gray	Lobeck	Stanley
Clark, Fla.	Gregg, Pa.	McGillicuddy	Stedman
Claypool	Gregg, Tex.	McHenry	Stephens, Miss.
Clayton	Gudger	Macon	Stephens, Tex.
Cline	Hamlin	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Ala.
Collier	Hammond	Mays	Thomas
Connell	Hardwick	Moore, Tenn.	Tribble
Cravens	Harrison, Miss.	Moore, Tex.	Turnbull
Cullop	Hay	Morrison	Underwood
Curley	Henry, Tex.	Murray	Watkins
Daugherty	Holland	Oldfield	Witherspoon
Davis, W. Va.	Houston	Padgett	Young, Tex.
Dent	Howard	Peters	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinkaid, N. J. Webb

NOT VOTING—83.

Ames	Evans	Higgins	Payne
Andrus	Fairchild	Hobson	Plumley
Anthony	Fields	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Ayres	Finley	James	Riordan
Bates	Fornes	Latta	Rodenberg
Bingham	Foster, Vt.	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Boehne	Fowler	Levy	Sharp
Bradley	Gallagher	Lindsay	Simmons
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Slemp
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Glass	McCall	Smith, N. Y.
Calder	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Stack
Campbell	Gould	Maher	Sulloway
Conry	Graham	Mitchell	Sulzer
Cox, Ohio	Griest	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Currier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Morse, Wis.	Talcott, N. Y.
Davenport	Harris	Olmsted	Tilson
De Forest	Heald	O'Shaunessy	Weeks
Draper	Heflin	Palmer	White
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Patten, N. Y.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROSENBERG.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. McCALL.

Until further notice:

Mr. GOULD with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. FIELD with Mr. PARRAN.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. MITCHELL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the first part of the amendment which has just been agreed to is not in proper form, and I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the amendment in order that it may be perfected, to give it the proper caption.

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to perfect the amendment as follows. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the first five lines and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. That a new section be added to said act at the end thereof, to be known as section 11, as follows: Section 11."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that is simply to put the proper caption to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 2, page 2, after the word "which," insert the words "a Representative or"; in line 3 strike out the words "in two or more States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 6, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is it proper at this stage of the proceedings to move to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The question was taken, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask what the number of the section is that was put on the bill a few moments ago?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to answer the gentleman, I will state that it will be section 2 of the bill and section 11 of the law.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit this bill to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with section 2 of the bill stricken out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the gentleman who makes the motion opposed to the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. As it is now, yes; and so is every other man who wants publicity.

Mr. MANN. Well, we are willing to vote for the bill. Let the gentleman vote against it on the final roll call. That is the test.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did not say I would vote against it on the final roll call.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recommit this bill to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress to report the same back forthwith with section 2 of the bill stricken out.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—yeas 155, noes 136.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 149, answered "present" 2, not voting 81, as follows:

YEAS—157.

Adair	Dickson, Miss.	James	Reilly
Adamson	Dies	Johnson, Ky.	Richardson
Aiken, S. C.	Difenderfer	Johnson, S. C.	Robinson
Allen	Dixon, Ind.	Jones	Roddenberry
Anderson, Ohio	Donohoe	Kindred	Rothermel
Ansberry	Doremus	Kipp	Rouse
Ashbrook	Doughton	Kitchin	Rubey
Barnhart	Edwards	Konig	Rucker, Colo.
Bartlett	Faison	Korbly	Rucker, Mo.
Bathrick	Ferris	Lamb	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Beall, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Legare	Saunders
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Lever	Scully
Boehrer	Foster, Ill.	Lewis	Shackelford
Brantley	Francis	Linthicum	Sheppard
Brown	Garner	Littlepage	Sherley
Burleson	Garrett	Littleton	Sims
Burnett	Godwin, N. C.	Lloyd	Sisson
Byrnes, S. C.	Goeke	Lobeck	Slayden
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	McCoy	Small
Callaway	Gould	McDermott	Smith, Tex.
Candler	Gregg, Pa.	McGillcuddy	Sparkman
Cantrill	Gregg, Tex.	McHenry	Stanley
Carlin	Gudger	Macon	Stedman
Carter	Hamlin	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Hammond	Martin, Colo.	Stephens, Tex.
Claypool	Hardwick	Mays	Taylor, Ala.
Clayton	Harrison, Miss.	Moore, Tenn.	Taylor, Colo.
Cline	Harrison, N. Y.	Moore, Tex.	Thomas
Collier	Hay	Morrison	Tribble
Connell	Helm	Murray	Turnbull
Covington	Henry, Tex.	Oldfield	Underhill
Cravens	Holland	Padgett	Underwood
Cullop	Houston	Page	Watkins
Curley	Howard	Peters	Witherspoon
Daugherty	Hughes, Ga.	Post	Young, Tex.
Davis, W. Va.	Hughes, N. J.	Pou	The Speaker
Dent	Hull	Rainey	
Denver	Humphreys, Miss.	Randall, Tex.	
Dickinson	Jacoway	Rauch	

NAYS—149.

Akin, N. Y.	George	Lindbergh	Roberts, Nev.
Alexander	Gillett	Loud	Sherwood
Anderson, Minn.	Good	McCall	Sloan
Austin	Goodwin, Ark.	McCreary	Smith, J. M. C.
Barchfeld	Gray	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Saml. W.
Bartholdt	Greene	McKinley	Speer
Berger	Guernsey	McKinney	Steenerson
Borland	Hamill	McLaughlin	Stephens, Cal.
Bowman	Hamilton, Mich.	McMorran	Sterling
Buchanan	Hanna	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Bulkley	Hardy	Madison	Stone
Burke, S. Dak.	Hartman	Malby	Sulloway
Burke, Wis.	Haugen	Mann	Sweet
Butler	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Switzer
Cannon	Hayes	Matthews	Taylor, Ohio
Cary	Helgesen	Miller	Thayer
Catlin	Hill	Mondell	Thistlewood
Cooper	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Towner
Copley	Howell	Morgan	Townsend
Cox, Ind.	Howland	Mott	Tuttle
Crago	Hubbard	Murdock	Utter
Crumpacker	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Volstead
Dalzell	Jackson	Nelson	Vreeland
Danforth	Kahn	Norris	Warburton
Davidson	Kendall	Nye	Wedemeyer
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Dodds	Kent	Pepper	Wickliffe
Dupre	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pickett	Wilder
Dwight	Knowland	Porter	Willis
Dyer	Konop	Powers	Wilson, Ill.
Esch	Kopp	Pray	Wilson, Pa.
Estopinal	Lafean	Prince	Wood, N. J.
Farr	Lafferty	Prouty	Woods, Iowa
Focht	La Follette	Pujo	Young, Kans.
Fordney	Langham	Raker	Young, Mich.
Foss	Langley	Ransdell, La.	
French	Lawrence	Rees	
Fuller	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinthead, N. J. Webb

NOT VOTING—81.

Ames	Ellerbe	Higgins	Plumley
Andrus	Evans	Hobson	Redfield
Anthony	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Riordan
Ayres	Fields	Latta	Rodenberg
Bates	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Bingham	Fornes	Levy	Sharp
Boehne	Foster, Vt.	Lindsay	Simmons
Bradley	Fowler	Longworth	Slemp
Broussard	Gallagher	Loudenslager	Smith, Cal.
Burgess	Gardner, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Maher	Stack
Calder	Glass	Mitchell	Sulzer
Campbell	Goldfogle	Moon, Pa.	Talbot, Md.
Conry	Graham	Morse, Wis.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cox, Ohio	Griest	Moss, Ind.	Tilson
Currier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Olmsd	Weeks
Davenport	Harris	O'Shaunessy	White
De Forest	Heald	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Draper	Hedlin	Parran	
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Patten, N. Y.	
Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Payne	

So the motion to recommit the bill with instructions was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. It is not proper to ask for a recapitulation until the vote is announced.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for a recapitulation.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the instructions of the House of Representatives, I report back from the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress the bill H. R. 2958, amended by striking out section 2 in accordance with the direction of the House, and upon that bill and amendment I move the previous question to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reports back from the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress the bill H. R. 2958, with an amendment striking out section 2, and on that and the passage of the bill he demands the previous question.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I take it it is necessary in any event to order a reengrossment of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is it in order to ask for a separate vote on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Why, a vote would be had on the amendment, of course. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment reported by the gentleman from Missouri from his committee.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri and Mr. HOUSTON demanded a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BORLAND. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. FERRIS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. There is already one pending.

Mr. BORLAND. Just a moment. The parliamentary inquiry is this: The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has reported a bill from his committee without any amendment on it. There is no amendment to vote on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BORLAND. The bill has been reported with the section stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The amendment that the gentleman from Missouri reported is to strike out section 2 of this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the amendment reported from the Clerk's desk. It has not been reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported?

Mr. MANN. I did not ask unanimous consent. I asked it as a matter of right.

Mr. ADAIR. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 2, which reads as follows:

"Sec. 2. That a new section be added to said act at the end thereof, to be known as section 11, as follows:

"Sec. 11. It shall be the duty of every candidate for Representative in Congress of the United States, at least 10 days before any general or primary election before which he is a candidate, to file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, in the District of Columbia, a full and correct statement of all moneys or things of value received from any source and used by him in any way for the purpose of securing his election, and said statement shall contain a true account of all moneys used by any agent or representative of said candidate for said purposes when known to the candidate. The said statement shall be verified by the oath of the candidate, taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the law of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate for Representative in Congress.

"The several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to punish violations of this act, and upon conviction of any candidate for the violation of this section or of filing a false statement of such expenses, he shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. The real thing to be voted on is striking that amendment out. When the names of Members are called those in favor of striking it out will say "aye" and those opposed will say "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 139, answered "present" 2, not voting 83, as follows:

YEAS—165.

Adair	Dies	Jacoway	Richardson
Adamson	Difenderfer	James	Robinson
Aiken, S. C.	Dixon, Ind.	Johnson, Ky.	Roddenberry
Alexander	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Rothermel
Allen	Doremus	Rouse	Rucker, Colo.
Anderson, Ohio	Doughton	Rubey	Rucker, Mo.
Ansberry	Dupre	Russell	Saunders
Ashbrook	Edwards	Scully	Shackelford
Barnhart	Estopinal	Sheppard	Sherley
Bartlett	Falson	Sherwood	Sims
Bathrick	Ferris	Sisson	Slayden
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Small	Smith, Tex.
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Sparkman	Stanley
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Stedman	Stephens, Miss.
Boober	Foster, Ill.	Stephens, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.
Borland	Francis	Taylor, Colo.	Thomas
Burleson	Garnier	Townsend	Tribble
Burnett	Garrett	Turbull	Tuttle
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Underhill	Underwood
Byrnes, Tenn.	Goeke	Watkins	Watkins
Callaway	Goodwin, Ark.	Witherspoon	Young, Tex.
Candler	Gordon	The Speaker	
Cantrill	Gould		
Carlin	Gregg, Pa.		
Carter	Gregg, Tex.		
Clark, Fla.	Gudger		
Claypool	Hamill		
Clayton	Hamlin		
Cline	Hammond		
Collier	Harrison, Miss.		
Connell	Harrison, N. Y.		
Covington	Hay		
Cox, Ind.	Helm		
Cravens	Henry, Tex.		
Cullop	Holland		
Curley	Houston		
Daugherty	Howard		
Davis, W. Va.	Hughes, Ga.		
Dent	Hughes, N. J.		
Denver	Hull		
Dickinson	Humphreys, Miss.		
Dickson, Miss.			

NAYS—139.

Akin, N. Y.	George	Lenroot	Raker
Anderson, Minn.	Gillett	Lewis	Rees
Austin	Good	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.
Barchfield	Gray	Loud	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Greene	McCall	Sloan
Berger	Guernsey	McCreary	Smith, J. M. C.
Bowman	Hamilton, Mich.	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Saml. W.
Brown	Hanna	McKinley	Speer
Buchanan	Hardy	McKinney	Steenserson
Bulkley	Hartman	McLaughlin	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, S. Dak.	Haugen	McMorran	Sterling
Burke, Wis.	Hawley	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Hayes	Madison	Stone
Cannon	Helgesen	Malby	Sulloway
Cary	Hill	Mann	Sweet
Catlin	Hinds	Martin, S. Dak.	Switzer
Cooper	Howell	Matthews	Taylor, Ohio
Copley	Howland	Miller	Thayer
Crago	Hubbard	Mondell	Thistlewood
Crumpacker	Humphrey, Wash.	Moore, Pa.	Towner
Dalzell	Jackson	Morgan	Utter
Danforth	Kahn	Mott	Volstead
Davidson	Kendall	Murdock	Vreeland
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Needham	Warburton
De Forest	Kent	Nelson	Wedemeyer
Dodds	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Norris	Whitacre
Dwight	Knowland	Nye	Wildner
Dyer	Konop	Patton, Pa.	Willis
Esch	Kopp	Pepper	Wilson, Ill.
Farr	Lafean	Pickett	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Lafferty	Porter	Wood, N. J.
Fordney	La Follette	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Langham	Pray	Young, Kans.
French	Langley	Prince	Young, Mich.
Fuller	Lawrence	Prouty	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.
Kinkaid, N. J. Webb

NOT VOTING—83.

Ames	Ellerbe	Higgins	Payne
Andrus	Evans	Hobson	Plumley
Anthony	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Ayers	Fields	Latta	Riordan
Bates	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Rodenberg
Bingham	Fornes	Levy	Sabath
Boehne	Foster, Vt.	Lindsay	Sells
Bradley	Fowler	Longworth	Sharp
Brantley	Gallagher	Loudenslager	Simmons
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	McKenzie	Slemp
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Maher	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Glass	Mitchell	Smith, N. Y.
Calder	Goldfogle	Moon, Pa.	Stack
Campbell	Graham	Morrison	Sulzer
Conry	Griest	Morse, Wis.	Talbott, Md.
Cox, Ohio	Hamilton, W. Va.	Moss, Ind.	Talcott, N. Y.
Currier	Harris	Olmsd	Tilson
Davenport	Heald	O'Shaunessy	Weeks
Draper	Hedlin	Palmer	White
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Patten, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So the amendment was adopted.

The following additional pair was announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. HARRIS.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 0, answered "present" 0, not voting 82, as follows:

YEAS—307.

Adair	De Forest	Helgesen	McGuire, Okla.
Adamson	Dent	Helm	McHenry
Aiken, S. C.	Denver	Henry, Tex.	McKinley
Akin, N. Y.	Dickinson	Hill	McKinney
Alexander	Dickson, Miss.	Hinds	McLaughlin
Allen	Dies	Hobson	McMorran
Anderson, Minn.	Difenderfer	Holland	Macon
Anderson, Ohio	Dixon, Ind.	Houston	Madden
Ansberry	Dodds	Howard	Madison
Ashbrook	Donohoe	Howell	Maguire, Nebr.
Austin	Doremus	Hubbard	Malby
Barchfield	Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Mann
Barnhart	Dupre	Hughes, N. J.	Martin, Colo.
Bartholdt	Dwight	Hull	Martin, S. Dak.
Bartlett	Dyer	Humphrey, Wash.	Mays
Bathrick	Edwards	Humphreys, Miss.	Miller
Beall, Tex.	Esch	Jackson	Mondell
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Jacoway	Moon, Tenn.
Blackmon	Falson	James	Moore, Pa.
Boober	Farr	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Tex.
Borland	Ferris	Johnson, S. C.	Morgan
Bowman	Fitzgerald	Jones	Moss, Ind.
Brown	Flood, Va.	Kahn	Mott
Buchanan	Floyd, Ark.	Kendall	Murdock
Bulkley	Focht	Kennedy	Murray
Burke, S. Dak.	Fordney	Kent	Needham
Burke, Wis.	Foss	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nelson
Burnett	Foster, Ill.	Kinkaid, N. J.	Norris
Butler	French	Kipp	Nye
Byrnes, S. C.	Fuller	Kitchin	Oldfield
Byrnes, Tenn.	Garner	Knowland	Padgett
Callaway	Garrett	Konig	Page
Candler	George	Konop	Patton, Pa.
Cannon	Gillett	Kopp	Pepper
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Korby	Peters
Carlin	Goeke	Lafean	Pickett
Carter	Good	Lafferty	Porter
Cary	Goodwin, Ark.	La Follette	Pou
Catlin	Gordon	Lamb	Powers
Clark, Fla.	Gould	Langham	Pray
Claypool	Gray	Langley	Prince
Clayton	Greene	Lawrence	Prouty
Cline	Gregg, Pa.	Lee, Ga.	Rainey
Collier	Gregg, Tex.	Legare	Raker
Connell	Gudger	Lenroot	Randell, Tex.
Cooper	Guernsey	Lever	Ransdell, La.
Copley	Hamill	Lewis	Rauch
Covington	Hamilton, Mich.	Lindbergh	Rees
Cox, Ind.	Hamlin	Linthicum	Reilly
Crago	Hanna	Littlepage	Richardson
Cravens	Hardwick	Lloyd	Roberts, Mass.
Crumpacker	Hardy	Loback	Roberts, Nev.
Curley	Harrison, Miss.	Loud	Robinson
Dalzell	Harrison, N. Y.	McCall	Roddenberry
Danforth	Hartman	McCoy	Rothermel
Davidson	Haugen	McCreary	Rouse
Davis, Minn.	Hawley	McDermott	Rubey
Davis, W. Va.	Hayes	McGillcuddy	Rucker, Colo.
			Rucker, Mo.

Russell	Sparkman	Taylor, Ohio	Webb
Sabath	Speer	Thayer	Wedemeyer
Saunders	Stanley	Thistlewood	Whitacre
Scully	Stedman	Thomas	Wickliffe
Shackelford	Steenerson	Towner	Wilder
Sheppard	Stephens, Cal.	Townsend	Willis
Sherley	Stephens, Miss.	Tribble	Wilson, Ill.
Sherwood	Stephens, Tex.	Turnbull	Wilson, Pa.
Sims	Sterling	Tuttle	Witherspoon
Sisson	Stevens, Minn.	Underhill	Wood, N. J.
Slayden	Stone	Underwood	Woods, Iowa
Sloan	Sulloway	Utter	Young, Kans.
Small	Sweet	Volstead	Young, Mich.
Smith, J. M. C.	Switzer	Vreeland	Young, Tex.
Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ala.	Warburton	The Speaker
Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Colo.	Watkins	

NOT VOTING—52.

Ames	Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Payne
Andrus	Ellerbe	Higgins	Plumley
Anthony	Evans	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Ayres	Fairchild	Latta	Riordan
Bates	Fields	Lee, Pa.	Rodenberg
Berger	Finley	Levy	Sells
Bingham	Fornes	Lindsay	Sharp
Boehne	Foster, Vt.	Longworth	Simmons
Bradley	Fowler	Loudenslager	Slemp
Brantley	Gallagher	McKenzie	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Matthews	Stack
Burke, Pa.	Glass	Mitchell	Stulzer
Calder	Goldfogle	Moon, Pa.	Talbot, Md.
Campbell	Graham	Morrison	Talcott, N. Y.
Conry	Griest	Morse, Wis.	Tilson
Cox, Ohio	Hamilton, W. Va.	Olmsted	Weeks
Currier	Harris	O'Shaunessy	White
Davenport	Heald	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Draper	Hollin	Parran	
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Patten, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:

On this vote:

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. HIGGINS.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

On motion of Mr. RUCKER of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the following cases, no adverse report having been made thereon:

At the request of Mr. RUCKER of Colorado, the papers in the case of Jeanie G. Lyles (61st Cong.).

At the request of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, the papers in the case of John P. Fitzgerald (H. R. 23132, 61st Cong., 2d sess.).

At the request of Mr. COVINGTON, the papers in the cases of William Lockart (61st Cong.); B. Strimel (61st Cong.); and Oscar Ernst (61st Cong.).

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two sides, one half of the time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in general debate.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And I will state that I intend to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] five hours of my time for him to yield to gentlemen on his side of the House who are in favor of the bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. Is it understood that there will be three days' general debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Two or three days.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman include that in his motion—the three days?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not ask for any limitation of time.

Mr. CLAYTON. I simply wanted the information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 4412, generally known as the reciprocity bill, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that the time be controlled, one-half by him and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Alabama yielding five hours—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not include that in the request.

Mr. JAMES. I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama if he yields five hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] and reserves a like time to himself,

and the opposition are to have 10 hours, that would mean 20 hours of general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it takes that length of time, we will continue the debate, and I have no desire to cut off debate unduly; but I should like to finish the general debate in three days, if we can do it.

Mr. BURLESON. Or even in a shorter time.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] is in accord with the gentleman from Alabama on this proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said that I would yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], to yield to gentlemen on that side who are in favor of the bill.

Mr. DICKINSON. Out of your time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Out of my time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. DALZELL. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that there is no desire on this side of the House, or upon the part of those whom I represent, to protract the debate unduly. I do not believe we will have any trouble at all in agreeing upon a time to close the debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course we want to conclude the debate on this bill at as early a date as practicable. There is no disposition not to give the Members who really want to debate the bill a fair opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave be given to each and all gentlemen who have addressed the House to-day on the publicity bill to extend remarks in the RECORD on that subject for five legislative days.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 15, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Willamette River from Oregon City to Eugene, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 13), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 52) to authorize the payment of certain claims for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, and the same was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 5137) to amend sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Arkansas," approved April 20, 1904; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5138) permitting the Minneapolis, St. Paul, Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 5139) to create a national arbitration tribunal and to define the duties and powers thereof; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) to provide for the award of congressional medals of honor to officers of the naval service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 5141) to provide and pay additional compensation to the rural free-delivery carriers of mail in the United States, and providing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) to establish a fish-culture station at the city of Fargo, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) to establish a fish-culture station at or near Sykeston, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 5144) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 5145) authorizing the city of Hot Springs, Ark., to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the fire department of said city on lot No. 3, block No. 115, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5146) providing for the construction of a walk from the National Military Cemetery at Natchez, Miss., to the sidewalks of the city of Natchez; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5147) to provide for the sale of the United States military reservation at Fort Walla Walla, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5148) to declare and define the jurisdiction of courts as to the question of the constitutionality of acts of Congress and of the various States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5149) for the relief of soldiers of the Civil War, the War with Spain, and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 5150) for the relief of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5151) to change the location of the office of collector of customs at Yaquina, Oreg., to Newport, Oreg.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5152) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at McComb, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5153) to cede jurisdiction to the State of Georgia over certain land in Fulton County; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER: Resolution (H. Res. 90) asking for investigation of "Taylor system" of shop management; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARTER: Resolution (H. Res. 91) requesting the President of the United States to furnish information regarding the appointment of D. C. McCurtain as chief of the Choctaws; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 92) requesting the President to transmit to Congress correspondence relating to Japanese immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: Resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to appoint clerk and messenger to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LLOYD: Resolution (H. Res. 94) providing for compensation for an attendant in the ladies' reception room of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) proposing an amendment to the Constitution by providing that all of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment except its first sentence shall be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5154) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Klinefelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) granting an increase of pension to George W. Luff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) granting an increase of pension to Martin Nighswander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Lafor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5159) granting an increase of pension to John H. Blessing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) granting a pension to Joseph McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) granting a pension to Herbert O. Kohr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5162) for the relief of Ramon B. Harrison; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 5163) granting an increase of pension to John F. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5164) granting a pension to Emma Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) granting a pension to Harriet Squier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5166) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Munklett, alias Henry Reinhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5168) granting an increase of pension to August Spergel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Walts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5170) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ehalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) granting an increase of pension to David Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5173) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert E. Bridgewater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5174) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5175) granting an increase of pension to William R. Lindley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Clark Duggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting an increase of pension to Pulaski T. Gaither; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) granting an increase of pension to Marquis L. Walts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) granting an increase of pension to Philip S. Duley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Lyman C. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) granting an increase of pension to Harrison M. Stratton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting an increase of pension to George D. Allhands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting an increase of pension to Coleman Romine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Reed, sr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) granting an increase of pension to Luther Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5188) granting an increase of pension to John L. Hix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5189) granting an increase of pension to William Birth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5190), granting an increase of pension to Francis X. Busam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5193) granting an increase of pension to William E. Jenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5194) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5196) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Klingel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5197) granting a pension to Agnes Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) granting a pension to Martin Hirt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting a pension to William Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) granting a pension to Mary A. Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5201) for the relief of Sarah Elizabeth Watson, administratrix of the estate of David Buck, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) for the relief of Girard G. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) for the relief of heirs of Moses J. Ferguson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) for the relief of the heirs at law of John A. Regan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5205) for the relief of the heirs of Louis Cato, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5206) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Clark, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5207) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Whitehead; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5208) for the relief of heirs or estate of Louis Summers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Fannie Solari, heir of Emanuel M. Solari, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5210) granting a pension to Annie W. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to M. B. Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of J. Caples Mallonee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) for the relief of the heirs at law of William Coolidge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5214) to pay to the heirs of Lieut. Col. John McIntosh, late of McIntosh County, Ga., certain moneys due for his services in the War of the American Revolution; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 5215) granting an increase of pension to La Roy B. Church; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5217) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5218) granting a pension to Margaret Furnier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5219) granting a pension to Arve Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5220) to correct the military record of Samuel P. Hedges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 5221) granting a pension claim to Joseph Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 5222) granting a pension to Mercy Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5223) granting a pension to Frederick L. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5224) for the relief of Joseph B. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of John T. Waters; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5226) for the relief of Jacob Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5227) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Fullerton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5228) for the relief of the legal heirs of John G. Burrus, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5229) granting an increase of pension to William Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) granting an increase of pension to William J. Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Cadle Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5234) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Bees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5236) granting an increase of pension to Moses A. Stark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) granting a pension to Sophia C. Nell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) granting a pension to Aaron B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5239) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5240) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kinzley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 5241) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Delos Dubois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5244) granting an increase of pension to William Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5246) granting a pension to George H. Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) granting a pension to Gilbert M. Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5248) granting a pension to Marcus L. Getter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5249) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan S. Tindall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5250) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5251) granting a pension to Nancy Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 5252) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. M. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 5253) granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5255) granting an increase of pension to William L. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5256) granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Monk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5257) granting an increase of pension to William W. Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5258) granting an increase of pension to Nelson E. Haskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5259) granting a pension to Mary K. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5260) granting an increase of pension to James M. Holliday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5261) granting an increase of pension to Commodore R. Lones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cheyne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) granting an increase of pension to Jamison R. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) granting an increase of pension to Henry U. Caswell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5266) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. A. Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5267) granting an increase of pension to John Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 5268) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) granting an increase of pension to Robert Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5270) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) to correct the military record of Patrick H. McGee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5272) granting an increase of pension to John Quigley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5273) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5274) granting an increase of pension to Catharine J. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5275) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5276) granting an increase of pension to John D. Coates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5277) granting a pension to Arthur B. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5278) for the relief of L. B. Wyatt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5279) for the relief of Maj. Sanford Willbanks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5280) for the relief of John Thomas Owen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) for the relief of Anderson Malon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5282) for the relief of Henry C. Haynes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5283) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Winston, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5284) to authorize the Secretary of War to correct the record of Calhoun Malone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5285) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension for Samuel L. D. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution of Bethlehem Grange, No. 1752, of Coshocton, Ohio, against the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, evidence to be filed with the claim of William Canady for special relief; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Resolution of Trades and Labor Council of Fond du Lac, Wis., remonstrating against the mobilization of United States troops along the border of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 68 farmers of Fond du Lac County, Wis., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty until the same principle of free trade can be applied to what the American farmers have to buy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Matter relating to repeal of eight-hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, letter of New York Cordage Co., relative to certain tariff rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of International Union of Steam Engineers, Local No. 315, insisting upon having the battleship *New York* built in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Republican Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the approval of the reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Flora Grange, Boone County, Ill., against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of citizens of Jackson and Nobles Counties, Minn., against passage of Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petitions of citizens of Jamestown, N. Dak., against rural parcels-post service, and of citizens of Walhalla, N. Dak., urging additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens and farmers of Walsh County, N. Dak., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers against the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of towns against establishment of a local rural parcels-post service on the rural-delivery routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition to increase the compensation of rural route free-delivery carriers of mail in the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of the heirs of Ephraim Jordan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolutions of the Georgia-Florida Sawmill Association, protesting against the reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of William J. Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Tennessee Legislature, requesting a return of the cotton tax by the Federal Government in the years 1861-1868 to the States for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of Local Bergen County Socialist Party, against sending troops to Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Johnsonburg Grange, No. 189, Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., protesting against a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petition of Ole Jacobson and 55 others, against the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of Charles F. M. Morgan, Company B, First Oregon Cavalry, relating to pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Hubbard Lake Grange, No. 192, Hubbard Lake, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Lafayette Mason, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of Fernando D. Foss and 51 others, relative to the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Coatesville, No. 170; Betsy Ross, No. 119; Pioneer, No. 389; Fairview, No. 89; Old Glory, No. 56; Wilkes-Barre, No. 102; Black Creek, No. 51; Energy, No. 284; Berwyn, No. 21; Egyptian, No. 144; Science, No. 52; Bloomsburg, No. 81; Reading, No. 122; Young America, No. 69; Friendship, No. 41; Columbia, No. 11; Hand in Hand, No. 50; Pride of East Mauch Chunk, No. 162; Magnolia, No. 183; Harmony, No. 124; Jennie Wade, No. 68; North Penn., No. 151; Cohocksink, No. 166; Purity, No. 48; Wisteria, No. 184; Hielman, No. 140; Fair, No. 791; Progress, No. 29; Morrae, No. 109; Pride of T. A. Armstrong, No. 92; Alfretha, No. 115; Richmond, No. 143; June Rose, No. 118; James G. Blaine, No. 2; Martha Washington, No. 37; Goddess of Liberty, No. 87; Spring Mountain, No. 171; Ann M. Ross, No. 187; Martha W. Crow, No. 65; Pride of West Hazelton, No. 201; General J. C. Fremont, No. 32; Pride of Williamsport, No. 104; West Park, No. 108; Relief, No. 16; General D. B. Birney, No. 51; Loyal, No. 94; Mount Carmel, No. 42; Windom, No. 93; Lansdale, No. 111; Major McKinley, No. 90; Lady Franklin, No. 85; Concord, No. 66; Evangeline, No. 179; J. P. Siegfried, No. 149; American Union, No. 537; Ardmore, No. 86; Unity, No. 14; James E. Hyatt, No. 127; Excelsior, No. 4; Lieutenant Cushing, No. 20; Valley Hill, No. 59; Sylvania, No. 71; Kensington, No. 67; Puritan, No. 185; Pen and Pencil, No. 120; Keystone, No. 107; Pottstown, No. 78; Opptown, No. 195; Pride of Conestoga, No. 142; Allegheny, No. 23; Pride of Manchester, No. 25; Columbian, No. 125; Lawrence, No. 61; Walter S. Newhall, No. 203; Young America, No. 407; Greble, No. 13; Harrogate, No. 979; Charles W. Riggin, No. 878; Shenandoah Valley, No. 530; Wissahickon, No. 100; Liberty, No. 2; Altoona, No. 152; Nuremberg, No. 763; West Park, No. 408; Lebanon Valley, No. 885; Fairmount, No. 321; Pride of Felton, No. 75; Chester, No. 36; Versailles, No. 691; Star, No. 55; Duncannon, No. 181; Pittston, No. 43; Riverside, No. 99; Harry Clay, No. 99; The Temple, No. 62; Sunbury, No. 31; Pittsburg, No. 34; E. A. Shubert, No. 5; Liberty Bell, No. 76; Kearsarge, No. 15; Greble, No. 1; Industry, No. 22; Lily of the Valley, No. 79; Milton,

No. 133; Volunteer, No. 13; Pride of Munson, No. 194; Good Interest, No. 187; Silver Crescent, No. 3; Resolute, No. 77; Pride of Welcome, No. 33; Logan, No. 60; Eden, No. 988; Malto, No. 36; Star of Oberlin, No. 155; Frankford, No. 123; Bellevue, No. 148; Lydia Darrah, No. 110; Clearfield, No. 146; General Putnam, No. 28; Wissahickon, No. 137; Dallastown, No. 105; and West Chester, No. 45, Councils of Daughters of Liberty, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring enactment of an illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution of Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sandy Creek, N. Y., in favor of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of Great Bend Grange, No. 642, Great Bend, N. Y.; Pennellville Grange, No. 729, Pennellville, N. Y.; Lafargeville Grange, No. 15, Lafargeville, N. Y.; Jefferson County Pomona Grange, Watertown, N. Y.; Amboy Grange, No. 779, Amboy Center, N. Y.; Star Grange, No. 9, Hannsfield, N. Y.; Thousand Island Grange, No. 593, Omar, N. Y.; Pulaski Grange, No. 730, Pulaski, N. Y.; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599, Cape Vincent, N. Y.; Oswego County Pomona Grange, Oswego, N. Y.; Indian River Grange, Antwerp, N. Y.; Smithville Grange, No. 60, Smithville, N. Y.; Plessis Grange, No. 629, Plessis, N. Y.; Lewis County Pomona Grange; Adams Center Grange, No. 590; and Gardner Corners Grange, Gardner Corners, N. Y., Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity bill (H. R. 4412); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of International Molders' Union, Local No. 78, of Watertown, N. Y., favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Resolutions of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., in favor of Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Papers to accompany bill for claim for arrearages of pension in case of Dr. Joseph Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Dr. C. F. King and 60 other citizens of Mount Cary, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 15, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, whose love fills all space with rays divine, we hallow Thy name for that greatest of all events which demonstrates the power of life over death and which will be celebrated on the morrow with prayers of gratitude and anthems of praise throughout all Christendom; make us worthy we beseech Thee of such love and power. May our spiritual eyes be opened that we may penetrate the veil and behold our loved ones on the golden shore with outstretched arms to receive us.

So long Thy power has blest us, sure it still
Will lead us on
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
The night is gone,
And with the morn those angel faces smile,
Which we have loved long since, and lost awhile.
And when the tongue is eloquent no more
The soul shall speak in tears of gratitude.

Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. PLUMLEY, a Representative from the second district of Vermont, appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, generally known as the reciprocity bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Inasmuch as the House is to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for a long, extensive, and important debate, I wish to inquire of the Speaker if the Committee of the Whole has any power to grant leave to print or to extend remarks in the Record?

The SPEAKER. It has not except to the individual. That has been the uniform practice since I have been here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, that if there is a desire on that side to have leave to print, I will ask unanimous consent at this time for all gentlemen who speak on the bill to have that right.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no such desire on this side; there is a desire to curtail it, and I suggest that the gentleman include in his motion a provision that any request in Committee of the Whole for the right to extend remarks, or to print remarks, be referred back to the House and not granted in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that that motion would not be in order. The right of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union is governed by the rules of the House, and my motion could not infringe on those rules. These rules clearly provide that the committee can not grant general leave to print, but that it can grant the right to extend remarks.

Mr. GARRETT. Any one Member can defeat it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true.

The SPEAKER. All this debate is by unanimous consent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the regular order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. SHERLEY took the chair amid general applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I do not intend to make the opening speech on this bill myself, but expect to close the debate. I yield one hour to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, in opening the debate on the pending measure, I shall ask permission at the outset to acknowledge in behalf of the Democracy of the House our thanks and gratitude to the President of the United States for giving us, in this call for an extra session, the opportunity to quicken the fulfillment of our pledges made to the people. [Applause on Democratic side.] How well and how faithfully we have embraced the opportunity thus far the proceedings of this House during the last 10 days attest. I wish, too, to congratulate the Democracy upon its prompt response to the people's will and the quick redemption of its promises.

Believing that the powers vested in and exercised by former Speakers were subversive of the rights of representative government, we pledged the people that if we were given control of the House we would write into its rules that the one-man power should be destroyed, that the Speaker, whoever he might be, should no longer have the power to appoint committees, to pack committees, so that such legislation as the one man, the Speaker, might wish should be kept in or brought out. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have faithfully kept that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Believing that, in the administration of the affairs of this House, there was wasteful extravagance of the people's money, that there had been useless offices created by the Republican Party and filled as political jobs, we pledged the people that, if we were given control, we would effect economy and abolish every political job in and around this Capitol. We have redeemed that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have not only abolished numbers of useless political offices and obsolete committees, but in the current expenses of the House we have effected an economy of 25 per cent, an annual saving to the people and to the Federal Treasury of more than \$180,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This, sir, is an earnest of that honest and economical administration which our party would give the country if intrusted with the control of all the departments of the Government.

Believing that the Senate of the United States, and its past several years' record amply justified the belief, was responsive neither to the will nor to the rights of the people, we pledged